

MATTHEW BRYAN GILLIS



HERESY AND DISSENT IN
THE CAROLINGIAN EMPIRE

The Case of Gottschalk of Orbais

OXFORD

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

HERESY AND DISSENT IN
THE CAROLINGIAN EMPIRE

Heresy and Dissent in the Carolingian Empire

The Case of Gottschalk of Orbais

MATTHEW BRYAN GILLIS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Matthew Bryan Gillis 2017

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

First Edition published in 2017

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016948394

ISBN 978-0-19-879758-6

Printed in Great Britain by
Clays Ltd, St Ives plc

For Monica

Acknowledgments

It is a tremendous pleasure to be able to acknowledge the many people and institutions whose contributions have made this study possible. My graduate advisor at the University of Virginia, Paul Kershaw, kindly offered his keen insight, curiosity, inventiveness, and support both during and after my graduate studies. Alon Confino, Ted Lendon, Elizabeth Meyer, Duane Osheim, Eric Rameriz-Weaver, and Robert Wilken each generously provided valuable suggestions and ideas that contributed greatly to my work during my years at the University of Virginia. Thanks to a Fulbright Fellowship to Austria (2005–6), I had the privilege of conducting my research in Vienna, where Walter Pohl, Helmut Reimitz, and Toni Scharer not only made it possible for me to use the resources of the Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, Universität, Vienna and the Institut für Mittelalterforschung, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien, but they also welcomed me warmly into Vienna's vibrant intellectual community and offered invaluable advice about my work in its earliest stages. During my years at Furman University, my fellow pre-modernists Ann Leen, Shelly Matthews, and David Spear kindly shared their ideas about my research as I finished my PhD. Most recently I have been especially fortunate in my colleagues at the University of Tennessee, and I am more than delighted to thank Bob Bast, Tom Burman, Ernie Freeberg, Luke Harlow, Tom Heffernan, Heather Hirschfeld, Gregor Kalas, Maura Lafferty, Jacob Latham, Vejas Liulevicius, Jay Rubenstein, Tina Shephardson, and Alison Vacca for their support and insights.

Parts of my research were presented at conferences and workshops, including: Texts and Identities; the Patristischer- und Frühmittelalterlicher Arbeitskreis, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften and Universität, Vienna; the Early Medieval History Seminar at the Institute for Historical Research, University of London; Wittgenstein Week at the Institut für Mittelalterforschung, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna; the German Studies Association; the American Historical Association; the American Society of Church History; *Nach Rom gehen—Monastische Reisekultur im Mittelalter*, Internationales Kolloquium am Stiftsarchiv St. Gallen, Kloster Einsiedeln, Switzerland; the Pre-Modern Reading Group, Furman University; and the Late Antiquity Seminar, University of Tennessee. I am most grateful for the helpful and insightful discussions I had with the participants at these gatherings.

To Lynda Coon, Andy Romig, and Oxford University Press's Readers A, B, and C—who each read the entire manuscript—I extend my profound gratitude for their generous and discerning comments, criticisms, and suggestions. This study has been immeasurably improved thanks to them. I am also grateful to those scholars who provided insights, encouragement, and support over the course of this project: Stuart Airlie, Kate Cooper, Richie Corradini, Mayke de Jong, Albrecht Diem, Max Diesenberger, Abigail Firey, David Ganz, Mary Garrison, Val Garver,

Patrick Geary, Eric Goldberg, Frank Gumerlock, Greg Hays, Martin Heinzelmann, Gerda Heydemann, Cristina La Rocca, Conrad Leyser, Rosamond McKitterick, Michael Moore, Jinty Nelson, James Palmer, Marianne Pollheimer, Janneke Raaijmakers, Els Rose, Roland Steinacher, Evina Steinová, Rachel Stone, Alan Thacker, Irene van Renswoude, Charles West, Herwig Wolfram, and Bernhard Zeller. I also thank my graduate and undergraduate students at the University of Tennessee, who have been a lively and engaging audience on Carolingian topics, Gottschalk not least among them.

I am most grateful for the wonderful financial support I have received for my project from several institutions. I am happy to thank the Fulbright Program; the Corcoran Department of History and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences at the University of Virginia; the Wittgenstein Project at the Institut für Mittelalterforschung, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna; and the University of Tennessee's History Department. I am also thankful to the people (including the folks at Interlibrary Loan Services) at the University of Virginia's Alderman Library, Furman University Library, the University of Tennessee's Hodges Library, and Bernie, Kim, and Mary in the History Department at the University of Tennessee for their help in acquiring materials for this study. Some aspects of this book's research appeared in previous publications, including "Noble and Saxon: The Meaning of Gottschalk of Orbais' Ethnicity at the Synod of Mainz, 829," in *Ego Trouble: Authors and Their Identities in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick, Richard Corradini, Irene van Renswoude, and Matthew Gillis (Vienna, 2010), and "Heresy in the Flesh: Gottschalk of Orbais and the Predestination Controversy in the Archdiocese of Rheims," in *Hincmar of Rheims: Life and Work*, ed. Rachel Stone and Charles West (Manchester, 2015). I am grateful to the Austrian Academy of Sciences and Manchester University Press for the permission to republish those sections. I also thank the Württembergische Landesbibliothek Stuttgart for the permission to use the image appearing on the cover of this book (Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Cod. bibl. fol. 23, f. 76v [detail]). At Oxford University Press, I am pleased to thank Stephanie Ireland for her remarkable efficiency and support as my acquisitions editor; Susan Ferber, who put me in touch with Stephanie; and Cathryn Steele for her kind assistance helping me prepare my manuscript for production. I offer my thanks to Christine Ranft for her keen-eyed copyediting, Albert Stewart for his proofreading, and Premkumar Kaliamoorthi for overseeing the whole production process of this book for OUP.

I am also grateful to my parents, Peter and Marsha Gillis, for consistently supporting and encouraging my interest in history. To my partner, dearest friend, and co-conspirator—Monica Black—I extend my greatest thanks for so many years of inspiration, mischief, travel, and laughter. She knows better than anyone where this study has taken me, and for sharing in those adventures I will remain ever thankful and delighted.

Contents

<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	x
Introduction: The Scandals of God's Servant	1
1. A Monk Against His Abbot, 829	24
2. Betrayal and Injustice in the Early 830s	52
3. A Missionary of Grace, ca. 835–848	76
4. A Theologian-Martyr in 849	118
5. Letters from Prison, 849–851	147
6. A Master of Subterranean Dissent, 850s	178
7. Resisting Heresy unto Death in the 860s	212
Conclusion: Heresy and Dissent in the Carolingian Empire	232
<i>Bibliography</i>	239
<i>Index</i>	271

List of Abbreviations

<i>CB</i>	<i>Charles the Bald: Court and Kingdom</i> , ed. Margaret Gibson and Janet Nelson, 2nd ed. (Aldershot, 1990)
<i>CCCM</i>	<i>Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis</i>
<i>CCSL</i>	<i>Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina</i>
<i>CH</i>	<i>Charlemagne's Heir: New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814–840)</i> , ed. Peter Godman and Roger Collins (Oxford, 1990)
<i>CSEL</i>	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i>
<i>EME</i>	<i>Early Medieval Europe</i>
<i>ET</i>	<i>Ego Trouble: Early Medieval Authors and their Texts</i> , ed. Rosamond McKitterick, Richard Corradini, Irene van Renswoude, and Matthew Gillis (Vienna, 2010)
<i>LI</i>	<i>Lay Intellectuals in the Carolingian World</i> , ed. Patrick Wormald and Janet Nelson (Cambridge, 2007)
<i>MGH Cap.</i>	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Capitularia</i> : I, ed. Alfred Boretius (Hanover, 1883); II, ed. id. and Victor Krause (Hanover, 1890)
<i>MGH Conc.</i>	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Concilia</i> : II, ed. Albert Werminghoff (Hanover, 1906–1908); III, ed. Wilfried Hartmann (Hanover, 1984); IV, ed. Wilfried Hartmann (Hanover, 1998)
<i>MGH Epp.</i>	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolae</i> : V, ed. Ernst Dümmler (Berlin, 1928); VI, ed. id. (Berlin, 1925); VIII, ed. Ernst Perels (Berlin, 1939)
<i>MGH SS</i>	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores</i>
<i>MGH SSRG</i>	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi</i>
<i>MGH SSRM</i>	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum</i>
<i>NCMH</i>	<i>The New Cambridge Medieval History, c.700–c.900</i> , vol. II, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge, 1995)
<i>CEG</i>	<i>Œuvres de Godescalc d'Orbais</i> , ed. Cyrille Lambot (Louvain, 1945)
<i>PL</i>	<i>Patrologia Latina Cursus Completus</i> , ed. Jacques P. Migne
<i>PLAC</i>	<i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini</i> : I, ed. Ernst Dümmler (Berlin, 1881); II, ed. id. (Berlin, 1884); III, ed. Ludwig Traube (Berlin, 1896); IV, ed. Karl Strecker (Berlin, 1914); VI, ed. Karl Strecker (Weimar, 1951)

Introduction

The Scandals of God's Servant

His name meant “God’s servant.”¹ Yet by the time Gottschalk sat down to compose his confession of faith at the monastery of Orbais in the winter of 848–9, he was already a condemned heretic. Since the 830s he had forcefully preached in Italy and as a missionary in southeastern Europe that God had predestined the elect to eternal life and the reprobate to eternal damnation before the establishment of the world. But the bishops at the Synod of Mainz (848) judged his teachings a perverse heresy.² Gottschalk refused to recant and was beaten with the rod as an insubordinate monk, forced to swear he would never again return to King Louis the German’s eastern Frankish kingdom, and then packed off to the Archdiocese of Rheims in King Charles the Bald’s western Frankish realm where he had become a monk at Orbais the previous decade.³ By refusing to recant and accept episcopal correction Gottschalk became a Carolingian rarity—a heretic in the flesh—at a time when heretics were seen as either distant, foreign dangers or the legendary villains of ancient church lore, fossilized and safely tucked away in codices on monastic bookshelves.⁴ Yet Gottschalk saw his public disobedience to these ecclesiastical superiors—behavior which they viewed as a sinful affront to the divinely-sanctioned world order—as an act of religious dissent necessary for defending God’s truth as one of the elect.

It was to that end that Gottschalk penned his confession of faith in what was the first known literary imitation of Augustine’s *Confessions*, quoting scripture back to God in order to emphasize the biblical origins of his doctrine while citing patristic texts to argue that Augustine and others had held his same views centuries before.⁵

¹ *Chronologisches Wörterbuch des deutschen Wortschatzes, Zweiter Band: Der Wortschatz des 9. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Elmar Seebold et al. (Berlin, 2008), p. 736; and *Die althochdeutschen Glossen*, ed. Elias Steinmeyer and Eduard Sievers (Berlin, 1898), IV, p. 345, 29.

² *MGH Conc.* III, No. 16 [Mainz, 848], pp. 179–84. This event and its sources are examined in Chapter 3.

³ The monastery of Orbais was established southeast of Rheims by Archbishop Rieul of Rheims (673–c.689). See Nicolas du Dubout, *Histoire de l’abbaye d’Orbais* (Paris, 1890), pp. 39–65. François Dolbeau and Martin Heinzelman, “Listes de noms champenois et anglais provenant de Saint-Remi de Reims (IXe-début XIIe siècle),” *Francia* 39 (2012), pp. 393–438, here p. 402 provide a list of ninth-century Orbais monks’ names that includes “Gottescalcus” from MS Paris B.N.F. 9903, fol. 47 (also cited by du Dubout, *Histoire*, p. 201).

⁴ Mayke de Jong, “Religion,” in *The Short Oxford History of Europe: The Early Middle Ages*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Oxford, 2001), pp. 131–64, here pp. 142–5.

⁵ Gottschalk, *Confessio prolixior*, *CEG*, pp. 55–75. On the text’s dating, stylistic devices, and use of biblical and patristic sources see Chapter 4.

The true heretics, he maintained, were those opposing him. In Gottschalk's eyes the Synod of Mainz had transformed him. He was now not only God's servant, but God's *faithful and persecuted* servant, a martyr whose confession contained much more than a theological argument. In a move unprecedented in Christian history, he would miraculously prove the truth of his ideas at another synod, he prayed: the king, clergy, and monks of the realm would be called together to witness a deadly ordeal (*examen*); in succession, he would climb in and out of four barrels of boiling liquids—water, oil, lard, and pitch—and emerge unscathed. Thus by the power of divine grace he would prove his faith and save the realm from heresy.⁶ Much like the martyrs in the Roman Empire through whom God performed miracles to show the truth and power of the Christian religion, God's miracle through Gottschalk would identify his faith as true in the Carolingian Empire.⁷

Heresy and Dissent in the Carolingian Empire is the first study to examine the remarkably large body of extant contemporary sources about Gottschalk, including those such as the confession he wrote himself. By reconstructing his life and thought, the book shows what his unique case of religious dissent can tell us about the history of the Carolingian era (c.715–c.888 CE), a formative period in medieval European history.⁸ The Frankish empire linked its political success to a program of moral “reform” (*correctio*) and perfection, intending to establish through it a world order harmonious with their vision of the Christian cosmos.⁹ This regime traditionally thrived on cooperation from ecclesiastical and secular elites as well as intellectuals, whose combined efforts enabled the dynasty to maintain order and to please an easily-offended deity.¹⁰ Carolingian theology was

⁶ Gottschalk, *Confessio prolixior*, CEG, pp. 74–5.

⁷ Elizabeth Castelli, *Martyrdom and Memory: Early Christian Culture Making* (New York, 2007); Michael Gaddis, *There is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ: Religious Violence in the Christian Roman Empire* (Berkeley, 2005), pp. 29–67; Lucy Grig, *Making Martyrs in Late Antiquity* (Norfolk, 2004); and Burton Mack, *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins* (Philadelphia, 1988).

⁸ Bernard Boller, *Gottschalk d'Orbais de Fulda à Hautvillers: une dissidence* (Paris, 2004), pp. 11–16 and 153–62 examines Gottschalk's dissent as a struggle against the forces of conformity in the “totalitarian” Carolingian world in the vein of Alexander Solzhenitsyn and other modern figures. Recent examinations of the Carolingian world include: Marios Costambeys, Matthew Innes, and Simon MacLean, *The Carolingian World* (Cambridge, 2011); Chris Wickham, *The Inheritance of Rome: Illuminating the Dark Ages, 400–1000* (New York, 2009), pp. 375–426; and Rudolf Schieffer, *Die Zeit des karolingischen Großreichs (714–887)*, Gebhardt Handbuch des deutschen Geschichte, vol. 2, 10th ed. (Stuttgart, 2005).

⁹ Owen Phelan, *The Formation of Christian Europe: The Carolingians, Baptism and the Imperium Christianum* (Oxford, 2014), esp. pp. 48–93; Michael Moore, *A Sacred Kingdom: Bishops and the Rise of Frankish Kingship, 300–850* (Washington: DC, 2011), pp. 203–85; Julia Smith, “Emending Evil Ways and Praising God's Omnipotence: Einhard and the Uses of Roman Martyrs,” in *Conversion in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages: Seeing and Believing*, ed. Kenneth Mills and Anthony Grafton (Rochester: NY, 2003), pp. 189–223; Giles Brown, “Introduction: The Carolingian Renaissance,” in *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 1–51; Rosamond McKitterick, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms, 789–895* (London, 1977), esp. pp. 1–44; and Percy Schramm, “Karl der Grosse: Denkart und Grundauffassungen—Die von ihm bewirkte ‘correctio’ (nicht ‘Renaissance’),” *Historische Zeitschrift* 198 (1964), pp. 306–45.

¹⁰ Thomas F.X. Noble, “Kings, Clergy and Dogma: the Settlement of Doctrinal Disputes in the Carolingian World,” in *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*, ed. Stephen Baxter et al. (Surrey, 2009), pp. 237–52; Matthew Innes, “Immune from Heresy’: Defining the Boundaries of

imperial politics on a cosmic scale, as rulers and intellectuals sought to make sure that their realm maintained divine favor. Rulers and their bishops defended the integrity and purity of the church in assemblies,¹¹ and relied on religious consensus in order to prosper, emphasizing the importance of ecclesiastical correction and the conversion of nonbelievers along with Christians' responsibility to work toward their own salvation through leading obedient, humble lives of repentance in loyalty to Christ.¹² Participation in this imperial religion required from the faithful a willingness to profess fidelity to the church's tenets (especially the doctrines of the Trinity, Christ's Incarnation and Resurrection, and the Last Judgment), to attend mass and participate in the church's sacramental life, and to accept clerical guidance, correction, and authority.

Sin created anxiety on many levels in the Carolingian Empire—spiritual, social, political—not only for the regime, but also for its subjects. Eliminating its offensive, corrupting influence was the duty of all Christians in the empire.¹³ Anxiety about the internal dangers of sin and the external threat of demonic, barbaric, non-Christian forces outside the empire together formed the troubling *doppelgänger* of imperial hopes for political power and religious salvation, shadowing the success of the Frankish empire and forming a dark side of its psyche—one that reared its head especially in moments of crisis and uncertainty. At the heart of this anxiety was the belief that the Devil and his servant Antichrist conspired ceaselessly to deceive

Carolingian Christianity," in *Frankland: The Franks and the World of the Early Middle Ages. Essays in Honour of Dame Jinty Nelson*, ed. Paul Fouracre and David Ganz (New York, 2008), pp. 101–25; Mayke de Jong, *The Penitential State: Authority and Atonement in the Age of Louis the Pious* (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 176–84; Ildar Garipzanov, *The Symbolic Language of Authority in the Carolingian World (c.751–877)* (Leiden, 2008); and Steffen Patzold, *Episcopus. Wissen über Bischöfe im Frankenreich des späten 8. bis frühen 10. Jahrhunderts* (Ostfildern, 2008).

¹¹ McKitterick, *Frankish Church*, pp. 1–79; Wilfried Hartmann, *Die Synoden der Karolingerzeit im Frankenreich und in Italien* (Paderborn, 1989); David Ganz, "Theology and the Organization of Thought," in *NCMH*, pp. 758–85, here p. 758; Mayke de Jong, "Charlemagne's Church," in *Charlemagne: Empire and Society*, ed. Joanna Story (Manchester, 2005), pp. 103–13, here pp. 106–11; and Noble, "Kings, Clergy and Dogma," pp. 237–52.

¹² Phelan, *The Formation of Christian Europe*, esp. pp. 94–146 and 207–61; Rachel Stone, *Morality and Masculinity in the Carolingian Empire* (Cambridge, 2012), *passim* but esp. pp. 27–68; Abigail Firey, *A Contrite Heart: Prosecution and Redemption in the Carolingian Empire* (Leiden, 2009), pp. 61–110; Andrew Romig, *Be a Perfect Man: Christian Masculinity and the Carolingian Aristocracy* (Philadelphia, forthcoming)—many thanks to the author for sharing his text before publication; Costamby et al., *The Carolingian World*, pp. 80–153; Valerie Garver, *Women and Aristocratic Culture in the Carolingian World* (Cornell, 2009), pp. 122–69; Thomas F.X. Noble, "Secular Sanctity: Forging an Ethos for the Carolingian Nobility," in *LI*, pp. 8–36; Smith, "Emending Evil Ways," pp. 189–223; de Jong, "Charlemagne's Church," pp. 103–35; Ian Wood, *The Missionary Life: Saints and the Evangelization of Europe, 400–1050* (New York, 2001), *passim* but esp. pp. 3–24; Ganz, "Theology," pp. 758–85; and McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 45–154.

¹³ Rob Meens, *Penance in Medieval Europe, 600–1200* (Cambridge, 2014), pp. 101–39 provides a historical overview of penance in the Carolingian era. On pollution, see Rob Meens, "Pollution in the Early Middle Ages: The Case of the Food Regulations in Penitentials," *EME* 4 (1995), pp. 3–19; Mayke de Jong, "What was Public about Public Penance? *Paenitentia Publica* and Justice in the Carolingian World," in *La Giustizia nell'alto medioevo, Settimane* 43 (1996), pp. 863–902; ead., "Pollution, Penance and Sanctity: Ekkehard's *Life of Iso of St. Gall*," in *The Community, the Family and the Saint: Patterns of Power in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. Joyce Hill and Mary Swan (Turnhout, 1998), pp. 145–58; ead., *The Penitential State*, pp. 185–213; and Firey, *A Contrite Heart*, pp. 61–110.

human beings and lead them into sin and error, perverting them and setting them against what Geoffrey Koziol has argued was regarded as the divinely-sanctioned, rational cosmic order.¹⁴ Paul Edward Dutton and Lynda Coon in particular have highlighted the Frankish world's disquieting fears.¹⁵ *Heresy and Dissent in the Carolingian Empire* works in a similar vein to emphasize not only the Carolingian hierarchy's anxieties about keeping order and containing the threat of sin Gottschalk represented to them, but also Gottschalk's own intense concerns about evil and the absolute need of grace for salvation.

Gottschalk's condemnations for heresy reveal most clearly how the Carolingian regime's response to his dissent took the form of correction and containment, underscoring that Christian doctrine was a zero-sum contest. Opponents could only be unorthodox and, therefore, must be seen as enemies of the faith. Following the Synod of Mainz (848) and the subsequent writing of his confession of faith, the episcopate of Charles the Bald's realm under the direction of Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims convicted Gottschalk again for his "incurable obstinacy and pestiferous teachings" at the Synod of Quierzy (849). Not only was he not allowed to carry out his proposed ordeal, but the bishops deprived him of his priestly office, had him beaten "almost to death" as a wayward monk who spurned episcopal authority, forced him to burn some of his writings, and then placed him in custody at the monastery of Hautvillers in a state of excommunication and imposed silence.¹⁶ He would remain there until his death approximately twenty years later. The problem Gottschalk posed for the bishops was not merely that he persisted in his beliefs, but also that he saw the council as an opportunity to debate them aggressively after the synod rejected those beliefs. In the bishops' view, he was a rogue theologian spreading dangerous novelties in the guise of traditional doctrines, while spurning their episcopal right to define orthodoxy. In other words, by refusing correction he unmasked himself as a wicked, deceiving heretic serving diabolical forces. The bishops saw Gottschalk's perverse ideas and disorderly behavior as two symptoms of a single spiritual disease from whose contagion they sought to protect other Christians by quarantining him in monastic imprisonment. While the Carolingian regime and its theologians generally saw sin as a contaminating and corrupting

¹⁴ Geoffrey Koziol, "Truth and Its Consequences: Why Carolingianists Don't Speak of Myth," in *Myth in Early Northwest Europe*, ed. Stephen Glosecki (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 75–95, esp. pp. 86–94. See also James Palmer, *The Apocalypse in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2014), pp. 126–88; and Kevin Hughes, *Constructing Antichrist: Paul, Biblical Commentary, and the Development of Doctrine in the Early Middle Ages* (Washington: DC, 2005), pp. 121–44.

¹⁵ Paul Edward Dutton, *The Politics of Dreaming in the Carolingian Empire* (Lincoln, 1994); and Lynda Coon, *Dark Age Bodies: Gender and Monastic Practice in the Early Medieval Latin West* (Philadelphia, 2011).

¹⁶ *MGH Conc.* III, No. 18 [Quierzy, 849], pp. 194–9. The monastery of Hautvillers was established north of Épernay approximately half way between Orbais and Rheims by Archbishop Nivard of Rheims (657–73) in 650. See Jean Baptiste Manceaux, *Histoire de l'abbaye et du village d'Hautvillers* (Épernay, 1880), pp. 70–107; and Michel Sot, *Un historien et son église au Xe siècle: Flodoard de Reims* (Paris, 1993), pp. 438–43.

force, Gottschalk's heresy and disobedience constituted a pollution of the most dangerous and loathsome kind.¹⁷

Carolingian bishops and theologians predominantly reserved accusations of heresy for foreigners (whether Adoptionists from Spain or Iconoclasts and Iconodules from Byzantium), whereas opponents within the empire were subjected to ecclesiastical discipline and reform.¹⁸ Favoring correction and a collective effort to define orthodoxy based on interpretations of earlier church sources, bodies of Frankish bishops saw themselves as the defenders of the faith. In the Carolingian period—as in the patristic era¹⁹—scholars and bishops' attempts to delineate between orthodoxy and heresy in doctrinal debates produced historically contingent definitions of "correct" and "false" beliefs.²⁰ Theologians frequently misunderstood and mischaracterized their opponents' positions, and often used late antique heresies such as Arianism or Nestorianism to describe them. Such definitions were developed from early Christian textual authorities in response to recurrently shifting ninth-century challenges. While these foreign heresies, in particular Adoptionism, tested Carolingian notions of orthodox belief and practice, they had ceased to be threats by Louis the Pious' death in 840.

There were also exceptional native cases of heresy.²¹ One was the eight-century Bishop Adalbert, a Frank who contested his condemnation after his support of late Merovingian-era spiritual practices apparently put him in opposition to Carolingian reforms led by Boniface in the 740s.²² Another was Amalarius of Metz, who quickly abandoned his allegorical treatment of the liturgy when it was declared

¹⁷ On heresy as pollution, see Firey, *A Contrite Heart*, pp. 111–58. For a similar assessment from a later period, see: Robert Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 2007), pp. 64–8 and 94–5.

¹⁸ John Cavadini, *The Last Christology of the West: Adoptionism in Spain and Gaul, 785–820* (Philadelphia, 1993); Ganz, "Theology," pp. 762–6 and 773–7; Ann Freeman, *Theodulf of Orléans: Charlemagne's Spokesman against the Second Council of Nicaea* (Aldershot, 2003), which is a collection of previously published articles; Celia Chazelle, *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era: Theology and the Art of Christ's Passion* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 14–74, 80, and 120; de Jong, "Religion," pp. 142–5; Innes, "Immune from Heresy," pp. 101–25; Thomas Noble, *Images, Iconoclasm, and the Carolingians* (Philadelphia, 2009), esp. pp. 150–206 and 287–365; Florence Close, *Uniformiser la foi pour unifier l'empire: contribution à l'histoire de la pensée politico-théologique de Charlemagne* (Brussels, 2011); and Palmer, *The Apocalypse*, pp. 151–7. On the problem of heresy, magic, and paganism in pre-Carolingian Francia, see Nicole Zeddies, *Religio et Sacrilgium: Studien zur Inkriminierung von Magie, Häresie und Heidentum (4.-7. Jahrhundert)* (Frankfurt am Main, 2003), pp. 199–279.

¹⁹ Lewis Ayers, "Articulating Identity," in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, ed. Frances Young, id., and Andrew Louth (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 200–21.

²⁰ Willemien Otten, "The Texture of Tradition: The Role of the Church Fathers in Carolingian Theology," *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, ed. Irena Backus, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1997), I, pp. 3–50.

²¹ Warren Pezè, "Hérésie, exclusion et anathème dans l'occident carolingien (742–années 860)," in *Exclure de la communauté chrétienne. Sens et pratiques sociales de l'anathème et de l'excommunication (IVe–XIIe siècle)*, ed. Geneviève Bührer-Thierry and Stéphane Gioanni (Turnhout, 2015), pp. 175–95 surveys cases of Carolingian heresy and their punishment.

²² Nicole Zeddies, "Bonifatius und zwei nützliche Rebellen: die Häretiker Aldebert und Clemens," in *Ordnung und Aufruhr im Mittelalter. Historische und juristische Studien zur Rebellion*, ed. Marie Theres Fögen (Frankfurt am Main, 1995), pp. 217–63; Innes, "Immune from Heresy," pp. 101–25; Firey, *A Contrite Heart*, pp. 114–17, 134–5, 139–43, and Palmer, *The Apocalypse*, pp. 148–50.

heretical in 838.²³ None of these cases, however, started a tradition of condemning individuals or groups inside the empire for heresy. Otherwise, Carolingian heretics besides Gottschalk were simply “imaginary others” and “a powerful metaphor for any possible threat to the politico-religious order”—the hobgoblins and straw men of biblical exegetes.²⁴

A central purpose of *Heresy and Dissent in the Carolingian Empire* is to shed light on Gottschalk’s special place in the history of Western Christendom as the Carolingian Empire’s and, arguably, early medieval Europe’s foremost religious dissenter.²⁵ As is well known, the related problems of dissent and religious coercion continue to be chief areas of interest for later medieval periods. That growing body of scholarship has greatly enriched our knowledge of medieval society and culture.²⁶ These studies tend to regard the post-Carolingian centuries as key to Latin Christendom’s development as a society that created and legitimized religious authority by persecuting perceived or actual religious difference and deviance.²⁷ Correspondingly, religious dissent and authority as historical problems have found little place in the narrative of the post-Roman world’s conversion and Christianization of Europe.²⁸

Gottschalk’s vigorous Augustinian critique of accepted traditions of hierarchy and doctrine makes his story as critical to rethinking the period’s religious and political history as examinations of anti-establishment reformers and heretics have been to the history of later medieval periods.²⁹ A key question in this respect is to

²³ Allen Cabaniss, *Amalarius of Metz* (Amsterdam, 1954); Ganz, “Theology,” pp. 777–8; Klaus Zechiel-Eckes, *Florus von Lyon als Kirchenpolitiker und Publizist* (Stuttgart, 1999), pp. 21–76; and Chazelle, *The Crucified God*, pp. 159–60.

²⁴ de Jong, “Religion,” pp. 142–5. See also Innes, “Immune from Heresy,” p. 122, note 64, as well as his point on p. 123, note 66 that the heresy of simony (rather than doctrinal error) in the Carolingian Empire requires further investigation.

²⁵ The early work of Jeffrey Burton Russel on dissent in pre-millennial Europe failed to encourage further research. See his *Dissent and Reform in the Early Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1965), pp. 5–53, 125–52, and 157–9 on Gottschalk specifically. As noted previously, Boller, *Gottschalk d’Orbais*, pp. 11–16 and 153–62 examines Gottschalk’s dissent as a struggle against the forces of conformity in the “totalitarian” Carolingian world in the vein of Alexander Solzhenitsyn and other modern figures.

²⁶ Introductions to the vast literature on later medieval popular heresy include Jennifer Kolpacoff, *History of Medieval Heresy and Inquisition* (Lanham: MD, 2011); Christine Caldwell Ames, *Medieval Heresies: Christianity, Judaism, and Islam* (Cambridge, 2015); and the older Malcolm Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation*, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 2002).

²⁷ Key studies include Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society; Inventer l’hérésie? Discours polémique et pouvoir avant l’Inquisition*, ed. Monique Zerner (Nice, 1998); Mark Pegg, *The Corruption of Angels: the Great Inquisition of 1245–1246* (Princeton, 2001); Dominic Iogna-Pratt, *Order and Exclusion: Cluny and Christendom Face Heresy, Judaism and Islam*, trans. Graham Robert Edwards (Ithaca, 2002); John Arnold, *Belief and Unbelief In Medieval Europe* (London, 2005); and Mark Pegg, *A Most Holy War: The Albigensian Crusade and the Battle For Christendom* (Oxford, 2008).

²⁸ For a recent reassessment of some of the key issues, see Peter Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200–1000*, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 2013), pp. xi–xlvii. Costambeys et al., *The Carolingian World*, pp. 80–153 outline many of the difficulties and complexities involved in the study of Christianity in the Carolingian era. Studies of dissent in *An Age of Saints? Power, Conflict and Dissent in Early Medieval Christianity*, ed. Peter Sarris, Matthew Dal Santo, and Phil Booth (Leiden, 2011) focus largely on the southern and eastern Mediterranean world.

²⁹ Another such figure is Bodo/Eleazar, who rejected Frankish Christianity and converted to Judaism, though he resided thereafter outside the empire and did not remain an internal figure of

what degree Robert Moore's model of later medieval Europe's "persecuting society" helps us understand the Carolingian Empire.³⁰ Nicole Zeddies applies this concept to Europe's Christian kingdoms during the centuries preceding the Carolingian era in her study of early medieval magic, heresy, and paganism.³¹ In a recent study on Frankish anti-Judaism in Lyons, Warren Pezé likewise applies Moore's model in this particular case to the Carolingian Empire along with Dominic Iogna-Pratt's argument that exclusion of "others" was central to high medieval Christendom's view of cosmic order.³² Yet in a recent survey of medieval heresy among Christians, Jews, and Muslims, Christine Caldwell Ames questions whether early medieval Europe had a persecuting society of the sort Moore describes.³³

While practices of persecution and exclusion existed in the Carolingian Empire, this study argues instead that the Frankish regime's response to perceived internal threats of Christian heresy and dissent centered on a different strategy: coercive reform. The imperial hierarchy's approach to Gottschalk shows that whenever possible it sought to preserve order among its Christian subjects by enforcing discipline and correction. In doing so, the regime's goal was to rescue offenders from their own sins and errors, while protecting the church from sources of spiritual corruption. Yet Gottschalk's case also reveals how rulers and bishops punished and imprisoned religious dissenters as heretics only in rare circumstances, when coercive reforming strategies failed. Putting it another way, this study argues that the Carolingian regime generally favored forced inclusion over exclusion among Christians in the empire, while simultaneously cultivating its prejudices against religious "others." Indeed, reform remained an ongoing concern among those punishing Gottschalk. The fact that he—an incorrigible heretic—was *not* executed like comparable figures in later periods, but was instead incarcerated and encouraged to recant and accept correction even on his deathbed, highlights the dramatic shift that took place in European Christendom after the Carolingian era.

Nevertheless, the response to Gottschalk's subversive disobedience and theological vision within this world of coercive reform makes clear how Carolingian theology was politics on a cosmic scale. In a doctrine designed to contradict generally held ninth-century religious truths about the possibility for individuals in the empire to achieve salvation, Gottschalk claimed that God had irrevocably and immutably divided humanity before the establishment of the world into the elect (those granted eternal life through freely-given divine grace) and the reprobate

dissent like Gottschalk. See Frank Riess, "From Aachen to Al-Andalus: the Journey of Deacon Bodo (823–76)," *EME* 13 (2005), pp. 131–57.

³⁰ Moore, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society*, pp. 3–5 on the "persecuting society."

³¹ Zeddies, *Religio et Sacrilegium*, throughout but esp. pp. 15–20 and pp. 186–9. Regarding Frankish Christianity and religious "others" before the Carolingians, see Zeddies, *Religio et Sacrilegium*, pp. 199–279 and Yitzhak Hen, *Culture and Religion in Merovingian Gaul, AD 481–751* (Leiden, 1995), pp. 154–206.

³² Warren Pezé, "Amalaire et la communauté juive de Lyon: À propos de l'antijudaïsme lyonnais à l'époque carolingienne," *Francia* 40 (2013), pp. 1–25, esp. pp. 2–3, 13, and 21. On the Jews in Lyons, see also Firey, *A Contrite Heart*, pp. 135–9 and 146–58.

³³ Ames, *Medieval Heresies*, pp. 23–4 on Moore's model, and pp. 127–36 on early medieval Europe. She regards Gottschalk (p. 130) as a "precursor" of high medieval mobile heretics.

(those justly punished with eternal death for their evil lives).³⁴ Despite his lack of significant rank in the church hierarchy, Gottschalk sought to overcome resistance to his teachings through deliberately aggressive and insubordinate methods of debate against opponents of whatever rank. Unlike his superiors who regarded “scandal” (*scandalum*) as a public sin that incurred divine wrath by threatening the established order,³⁵ Gottschalk claimed to embrace scandal and controversy as means for spreading divine truth outside conventional ecclesiastical channels.³⁶ Indeed, by being outside these structures of power, he shows clearly how answering the question “Whom does the deity favor?” was a carefully-guarded prerogative of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Gottschalk’s goal was to “awaken” the elect in his lifetime, so they would become distinguishable and thus separate from the reprobate through their belief and confession of his doctrine—activities designed fundamentally to reshape Frankish religion by disrupting the imperial order and dividing its community.

As a rare case of Carolingian religious dissent, Gottschalk’s ideas and career provide a unique opportunity to view Frankish imperial Christianity from the perspective of someone raised and educated in that religion, but who nevertheless tried to subvert some of its most basic ideas. What makes his case particularly important is that his condemnation proved as controversial as his teachings, indicating the ruling powers’ limited control over doctrinal questions after the troubled 830s and 840s. This was a time when rebellions against Emperor Louis the Pious in the 830s were followed after his death by civil war between the forces of his royal sons, division of the empire, and Viking raids in the 840s.³⁷ Rulers and reformers feared that the disorders of the time were the result of divine wrath, and they sought to establish the new realms of the divided Carolingian Empire by recovering divine favor through the traditional approach of correcting errors and eliminating conflict and disorder. Yet following Gottschalk’s condemnation, several leading theologians agreed with the essential elements of his teachings on grace (if not his methods) rather than those of the archbishops who condemned him—Hrabanus Maurus of Mainz and Hincmar of Rheims.³⁸ The result was the so-called

³⁴ The most recent assessments of Gottschalk’s doctrine of grace include David Ganz, “The Debate on Predestination,” in *CB*, pp. 283–302, here pp. 287–9; id., “Theology,” pp. 768–9; Chazelle, *The Crucified God*, pp. 172–81; *Gottschalk*, ed. Genke and Gumerlock, pp. 54–61; and Matthew Bryan Gillis, “Heresy in the Flesh: Gottschalk of Orbais and the Predestination Controversy in the Archdiocese of Rheims,” in *Hincmar of Rheims: His Life and Work*, ed. Rachel Stone and Charles West (Manchester, 2015), pp. 247–67.

³⁵ de Jong, *The Penitential State*, pp. 121, 151–2, 232–3, and 237–9.

³⁶ Gottschalk, *Confessio prolixior*, *CEG*, pp. 68–9.

³⁷ Costambys et al., *The Carolingian World*, pp. 213–22 and 379–407; Eric Goldberg, *Struggle for Empire: Kingship and Conflict under Louis the German, 817–876* (Cornell, 2009), pp. 86–185; de Jong, *The Penitential State*; Dutton, *The Politics of Dreaming*, pp. 81–156; and Janet Nelson, *Charles the Bald* (New York, 1992), pp. 105–59.

³⁸ On Hrabanus, see: Coon, *Dark Age Bodies*, pp. 13–41; Stephanie Haarländer, *Hrabanus Maurus zum Kennenlernen. Ein Lesebuch mit einer Einführung in sein Leben und Werk* (Mainz, 2006); and Hrabanus Maurus: *Lehrer, Abt und Bischof*, ed. Raymund Kottje and Harald Zimmermann (Mainz, 1992). On Hincmar, see: *Hincmar of Rheims: Life and Work*, ed. Rachel Stone and Charles West (Manchester, 2015); Jean Devisse, *Hincmar: Archevêque de Reims, 845–882*, 3 vols. (Geneva, 1975);

predestination controversy of the 850s, arguably the Carolingian world's most vituperative doctrinal debate.³⁹

Meanwhile, disaffected young monks and clerics of Charles the Bald's kingdom read smuggled pamphlets containing Gottschalk's teachings and followed his example of resisting Hincmar of Rheims' controversial reforms by forming an underground textual community right within the archbishop's see.⁴⁰ Accepting persecution as emblematic of his righteousness, Gottschalk encouraged these young readers to propagate and defend his outlawed views. The predestination controversy, Gottschalk's ongoing defiance, and the subterranean support for his forbidden teachings show how the dissension and upheaval of the 830s and 840s created fertile ground for new forms of resistance to authority in the 850s. Following Gottschalk's death, the monks of Hautvillers included him in their *necrologium*, or book of the dead, praying for him on the anniversary of his death with little regard for Hincmar's authority or Gottschalk's condemnation.⁴¹

APPROACHES TO A NINTH-CENTURY LIFE

Heresy and Dissent in the Carolingian Empire is neither a comprehensive commentary on Gottschalk's complete corpus nor a study of the manuscripts containing them. Instead, it seeks to recover as much as possible Gottschalk's experiences and thought in the extant, ninth-century sources. These texts offer a host of startling and intriguing fragments about him and his ideas that frequently amount to little more than elusive, puzzling, even contradictory evidence. Several different traditions of writing early medieval lives provide helpful models for approaching this material. Scholars have examined the careers of ninth-century rulers and bishops, offering examples of how powerful figures in the Carolingian Empire shaped the politics and ideas of their era through the exercise of their offices.⁴² These studies frequently highlight the intimate connections between politics and religion, yet as potential templates they are of limited help in Gottschalk's case, since they recreate dynastic and episcopal success stories whose political vantage point is from the highest positions of authority, however many struggles those rulers and bishops

and Heinrich Schrörs, *Hincmar Erzbischof von Reims: Sein Leben und seine Schriften* (Freiburg, 1884; reprinted: Hildesheim, 1967).

³⁹ Chazelle, *The Crucified God*, pp. 165–208; and Ganz, "The Debate," pp. 283–302.

⁴⁰ Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton, 1983), pp. 88–101 and 145–50.

⁴¹ The *necrologium* appears to be lost, but see Jean-Loup LeMaitre, *Répertoire des documents nécrologiques français*, no. 1687 (Paris, 1980), here II, pp. 726–7, which refers to Jean Mabillon's notes about the manuscript in Paris B.N.F. MS Lat. 11902, where the name "Godescalcus" appears on fol. 5r under III. kal. November (October 30); Jean Mabillon, *Annales ordinis sancti Benedicti*, vol. III, XXXVI, 42 (Paris, 1706), p. 125; and *Gallia Christiana* (Paris, 1751), IX, p. 423.

⁴² A few key examples of recent studies of Carolingian rulers include: Nelson, *Charles the Bald: Goldberg, Struggle for Empire*; Rosamond McKitterick, *Charlemagne: The Formation of a European Identity* (Cambridge, 2008); and de Jong, *The Penitential State*. The classic study of a Carolingian bishop is Devisse, *Hincmar*.

might have had during their reigns. More helpful are studies of Augustine, Anselm, Abelard, and Guibert de Nogent, which reconstruct the life and thought of their subject either as a “figure in a landscape” or as an intellectual biography in order to contextualize and problematize these individuals in light of a historiography that tends to view them as heroes, villains, subjects for psychohistorical analysis, or people whose identities and experiences are reducible to particular theological positions or controversies.⁴³ In each case, these works reveal their subjects to have been complex individuals shaping their times and being shaped by them.

Gottschalk’s notoriety among contemporaries and the complex nature of the surviving evidence—which includes his very own partisan writings and many hostile to him, as well as frequent gaps in the historical record—mean that a disciplined imagination is helpful for recovering his experiences and ideas perhaps even more so than in the case of those intellectuals just mentioned.⁴⁴ The practices of microhistory offer additional ways of bringing his unique perspective on the Carolingian Empire to light along these lines.⁴⁵ Microhistorians tend to focus on historical individuals outside the structures of power, whose stories and views of contemporary events, people, problems, and ideas offer a fascinating and often provocative counterpoint to dominant ones.⁴⁶ Likewise, microhistorians’ emphasis on the anomalous and idiosyncratic rather than the prevailing, representative, and normative is useful for reframing Carolingian history from the outlook of Gottschalk’s very unusual historical circumstances.

By combining the sensitivities and creativity of the microhistorian with these other modes of researching medieval individuals, this book retraces Gottschalk’s entire career from his beginnings as a promising young intellectual to his transformation into the most notorious religious outlaw of his day, investigating his individual experiences and metamorphoses, the development of his ideas, and the various strategies he used to influence contemporaries and to shape the complex political and religious world of his time. In doing so, this study both builds on and departs from previous Gottschalk scholarship, whose long development requires a brief discussion. Following the publication of some of his writings by James Ussher and Gilbert Maguin in the seventeenth century, theologians and church historians

⁴³ Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography*, new ed. (Berkeley, 2000); Richard Southern, *Saint Anselm: A Portrait in a Landscape* (Cambridge, 1990); Michael Clanchy, *Abelard: A Medieval Life* (Oxford, 1997); Jay Rubenstein, *Guibert of Nogent: Portrait of a Medieval Mind* (New York, 2002); and James O’Donnell, *Augustine: A New Biography* (New York, 2005).

⁴⁴ Garver, *Aristocratic Women in the Carolingian Empire*, p. 12 makes the same point about reconstructing the experiences of Carolingian noble women.

⁴⁵ Carlo Ginzburg, “Microhistory: Two or Three Things That I Know About It,” trans. John Tedeschi and Anne Tedeschi, *Critical Inquiry* 20 (1993), pp. 10–35; Brad Gregory, “Is Small Beautiful? Microhistory and the History of Everyday Life,” *History and Theory* 38 (1999), pp. 100–10; and Sigurður Gylfi Magnússon and István Sziárdó, *What is Microhistory: Theory and Practice* (New York, 2013), including a discussion of criticisms of microhistory, pp. 119–31.

⁴⁶ Two classic studies are Carlo Ginzburg, *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller*, trans. John Tedeschi and Anne Tedeschi (Baltimore, 1980); and Natalie Zemon Davis, *The Return of Martin Guerre* (Cambridge: MA, 1983). For a recent example, see Laura Nenzi, *The Chaos and Cosmos of Kurosawa Tokiko: One Woman’s Transit from Tokugawa to Meiji Japan* (Honolulu, 2015), who discusses the merits of microhistory approaches, pp. 2–6.

began using Gottschalk's long-forgotten teachings in their own doctrinal debates on the role of grace in salvation.⁴⁷ The theological tradition of Gottschalk scholarship took a decidedly nationalist turn among German scholars in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when his ethnicity as well as his teachings became central to contemporary debates.⁴⁸ For instance, Gottschalk—who was the son of a Saxon count—was taken to represent the forcibly converted Saxons resisting Frankish domination in vain, and was seen as one who went mad from monastic confinement and became a martyr for the Augustinian doctrines that seemed to explain his fate.⁴⁹ Gottschalk was also compared to Luther and viewed as an emblematic German Christian;⁵⁰ he was characterized as a German Calvin,⁵¹ and even identified as an “Augustinian” personality.⁵² While modern confessional interest in Gottschalk's doctrines is understandable, it is important to see Gottschalk as a ninth-century thinker whose career and goals were inseparable from his historical moment.

A major turning point in modern Gottschalk studies was Cyrille Lambot's 1945 edition of his hitherto unidentified prose works surviving in two manuscripts, Bern Bürgerbibliothek 83 and 584, along with various previously printed sources.⁵³ Bern Bürgerbibliothek 83 contains two halves that were made to form one manuscript in

⁴⁷ *Gotteschalci, et praedestinatarum controversiae ab eo motae, historia: una cum duplici ejusdem confessione, nunc primum in lucem edita*, ed. James Ussher (Dublin, 1631); and *Veterum auctorum qui IX saeculo de praedestinatione et gratia scripserunt opera et fragmenta plurima nunc primum in lucem edita*, ed. Gilbert Maguin (Paris, 1650). On Ussher's engagement with Gottschalk, see Alan Ford, *James Ussher: Theology, History, and Politics in Early-Modern Ireland and England* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 155–60. In addition to Ussher's and Maguin's works, early modern studies of Gottschalk include Jacques Sirmond, *Historia praedestinatarum* (Paris, 1648); Louis Cellot, *Historia Gotteschalci praedestinarii* (Paris, 1655); and Enrico Noris, *Historiae Gothescalcanae synopsis* (Verona, 1729).

⁴⁸ Siegfried Epperlein, *Herrschaft und Volk im karolingischen Imperium* (Berlin, 1969), pp. 185–6 outlines the contours of this scholarship.

⁴⁹ Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 88–96; and Albert Freystedt, “Studien zu Gottschalks Leben und Lehre,” *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 18 (1898), pp. 1–22, 161–82, and 529–45, here 15–18 and 162–3.

⁵⁰ Erich Dinkler, *Gottschalk der Sachse. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach Germanentum und Christentum* (Berlin, 1936), which includes a German translation of some of his poetry by Erwin Wißmann, pp. 41–2; Hermann Dörries, “Gottschalk, ein christlicher Zeuge der deutschen Frühzeit,” *Junge Kirche* 5 (1937), pp. 670–84; and Walter Kagerah, *Gottschalk der Sachse* (Dissertation, Greifswald, 1938), pp. 5–6.

⁵¹ Hans von Schubert, *Geschichte des deutschen Glaubens im frühen Mittelalter* (Tübingen, 1921), p. 48.

⁵² Marie Christine Mitterauer, *Gottschalk der Sachse und seine Gegner im Prädestinationsstreit* (Dissertation, Vienna, 1956), pp. 2, 7 and 77–94. Klaus Vielhaber, *Gottschalk der Sachse* (Bonn, 1956) also emphasized this aspect of Gottschalk's thought.

⁵³ Gottschalk of Orbais, *Œuvres théologiques et grammaticales de Godescalc d'Orbais*, ed. Cyrille Lambot (Louvain, 1945). There is also now a translation of many of Gottschalk's predestination writings: *Gottschalk and a Medieval Predestination Controversy: Texts Translated from the Latin*, ed. and trans. Victor Genke and Francis Gumerlock (Milwaukee, 2010). On the manuscripts, see Hermann Hagen, *Catalogus codicum Bernensium (Bibliotheca Bongarsiana)* (Bern, 1875), pp. xiv–xxvi and 101–2; Frederick Carey, “The Scriptorium of Rheims during the Archbishopric of Hincmar, 845–882 A.D.,” *Classical and Medieval Studies in Honor of Edward Kennard Rand* (New York, 1938), pp. 41–60, here p. 58; Lambot, *Œuvres*, pp. x and xii; Beat Matthias von Scarpatetti, *Katalog der datierten Handschriften*, 3 vols. (Zürich, 1977–1991), here 2, pp. 679–81; and Bernhard Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen)*. Teil I: Aachen-Lambach (Wiesbaden, 1998), pp. 106 and 130.

the sixteenth century, with the portion containing Gottschalk's texts (two grammatical treatises) having been copied for a monk named Emmo at the monastery of Saint-Remi in Rheims, who was there between 945 and 967.⁵⁴ Bürgerbibliothek 584 was probably copied around Rheims in the mid to late ninth century and includes a number of Gottschalk's theological writings.⁵⁵ Both manuscripts were acquired by Jacques Bongars (1554–1612), possibly from Rheims.⁵⁶ In 1931, Germain Morin recognized Gottschalk as the author of numerous theological texts in Bern Bürgerbibliothek 584, and Lambot began editing them along with two grammatical treatises that he identified in Bern Bürgerbibliothek 83.⁵⁷ Lambot gave titles to Gottschalk's various works in his edition, save for the theological texts *De trina deitate* and *De praedestinatione*, whose titles appear in the manuscript.⁵⁸

Lambot also included in his edition those of Gottschalk's prose works surviving in early printed versions. These include fragments of his otherwise lost texts that were preserved in Hincmar's works, his *Ad reclusos et simplices*, *De una et non trina deitate*, and *Liber de praedestinatione*; the first of these was published in the late nineteenth century while latter two were in turn edited, first by Jacques Sirmond in the seventeenth century from lost manuscripts, and then reprinted in Jacques Paul Migne's *Patrologia Series Latina*.⁵⁹ A second set of Gottschalk's prose works, the so-called *Confessio brevior* and *Confessio prolixior* (the latter being the text discussed at the beginning of this book), were edited in the seventeenth century by James Ussher (who titled the texts) and by Gilbert Mauguin.⁶⁰ Based on their editions, Ussher and Mauguin appear to have used different manuscripts, and the only codex among them to survive appears to be a ninth-century one from Corbie containing the *Confessio brevior*, along with several other predestination texts.⁶¹

Gottschalk's verse—including letters, hymns, and poems—survives in numerous manuscripts.⁶² These works were edited by a series of scholars in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as they were identified to be Gottschalk's, including:

⁵⁴ Cyrille Lambot, "Opusculs grammaticaux de Gottschalk," *Revue Bénédictine* 44 (1932), pp. 120–4; and id., *Œuvres*, pp. ix–xi.

⁵⁵ Carey, "Scriptorium," p. 58; Lambot, *CEG*, p. xii; and Bischoff, *Katalog*, p. 130.

⁵⁶ Hagen, *Catalogus*, pp. xiv–xxvi and 101–2; Carey, "Scriptorium," p. 58; Lambot, *CEG*, pp. x and xii; von Scarpatetti, *Katalog*, vol. II, pp. 679–81; and Bischoff, *Katalog*, p. 106.

⁵⁷ Germain Morin, "Gottschalk retrouvé," *Revue Bénédictine* 43 (1931), pp. 303–12; and Lambot, "Opusculs," pp. 120–4. See also: Max Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, vol. I (Munich, 1911), pp. 476–8.

⁵⁸ Gottschalk, *De trina deitate*, *CEG*, pp. 81–130; and id., *De praedestinatione*, *CEG*, pp. 180–258.

⁵⁹ Hincmar, *Ad reclusos et simplices*, ed. Wilhelm Gundlach, "Zwei Schriften des Erzbischofs Hincmar von Rheims II," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 10 (1889) pp. 258–310; Hincmar, *De una et non trina deitate*, ed. Jacques Sirmond, *Hincmari archiepiscopi Remensis opera*, vol. I (Paris, 1645), pp. 413–555, reprinted: *PL* 125: 473–618; id., *Liber de praedestinatione*, ed. Sirmond, *Hincmari*, vol. I, pp. 1–410, reprinted: *PL* 125: 65–474; and Gottschalk, *Fragmenta*, *CEG*, pp. 9–10 and 19–46.

⁶⁰ *Gotteschalci, et praedestinationariae controversiae ab eo motae, historia*, ed. Ussher, pp. 208–33; *Veterum auctorum qui IX saeculo de praedestinatione et gratia scripserunt opera*, ed. Maguin, vol. I, pp. 7–24; and Gottschalk, *Confessio brevior* and *Confessio prolixior*, *CEG*, pp. 52–4 and 55–78.

⁶¹ The manuscript in question is Paris, B.N.F. Lat. 12292; see, Lambot, *CEG*, pp. xx–xxii and David Ganz, *Corbie in the Carolingian Renaissance* (Sigmaringen, 1990), p. 157.

⁶² Ludwig Traube, "Godescalci Carmina," *PLAC* III, pp. 720–2; Norbert Fickermann, "Wiedererkannte Dichtungen Gottschalks," *Revue Bénédictine* 44 (1932), pp. 314–21; and Marie-Luise Weber, *Die Gedichte des Gottschalk von Orbais* (Frankfurt, 1992), pp. 81–117.

Ludwig Traube (who also wrote a detailed narrative of his life), Karl Strecker, Cyrille Lambot, and Norbert Fickermann (who edited the verse found in Bern Bürgerbibliothek 584).⁶³ Subsequently, Felix Rädle produced a new edition of Gottschalk's verse letter to Prudentius of Troyes, his *Quo ne tu missus*, first edited by Strecker, while Marie-Luise Weber has done the same for most of the other poetry based on a re-examination of all the manuscripts.⁶⁴ In my analysis of these texts, I have generally consulted both the early and recent editions.

A second major shift in Gottschalk studies occurred in the late 1960s when his doctrines came to be understood as political criticisms of the Carolingian church and hierarchy. The path was blazed by the East German historian, Siegfried Epperlein, who included Gottschalk in his study of resistance to the "feudal" Frankish church and society.⁶⁵ Since Epperlein's work, studies on Gottschalk and his thought have brought into relief how threatening the early medieval ascetic's doctrines were to the collectively-minded ruling elite's control over the socio-political order in the turbulent era of a divided Carolingian Empire.⁶⁶ More recently, Gottschalk's condemnation has been seen as an exercise of episcopal control and church discipline, and his doctrines have begun to be contextualized in the wider, ongoing ninth-century project of interpreting Christian revelation.⁶⁷ Yet these important studies have only examined episodes of Gottschalk's life, focusing on specific controversies—such as the issue of his forced tonsuring as a child at the monastery of Fulda,⁶⁸ the predestination controversy,⁶⁹

⁶³ Gottschalk, *Carmina*, PLAC III, pp. 723–38, and, for Traube's narrative, pp. 707–21; id., *Quo ne tu missus*, PLAC IV, pp. 934–6; id., *Epistola*, CEG, pp. 49–51; id., "Carmina," PLAC VI, pp. 86–106; and Cyrille Lambot, "Lettre inédite de Godescalc d'Orbais," *Revue Bénédictine* 68 (1958), pp. 40–51.

⁶⁴ Fidel Rädle, "Gottschalks Gedicht an seinen letzten Freund," in *Scire litteras: Forschungen zum mittelalterlichen Geistesleben*, ed. Sigrid Krämer and Michael Bernhard (Munich, 1988), pp. 315–25, here 316–19; and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 135–87.

⁶⁵ Epperlein, *Herrschaft*, pp. 198–9, 226–9 and 241.

⁶⁶ Gangolf Schrimpf, "Hrabanus in die ethischen Implikationen der Auseinandersetzung zwischen Gottschalk und Hraban um die Prädestinationslehre," in *Hrabanus Maurus und seiner Schule*, ed. W. Böhne (Fulda, 1980), pp. 164–74; and Ganz, "The Debate," pp. 283–302.

⁶⁷ Dutton, *The Politics of Dreaming*, pp. 130–2; Albrecht Diem, "Een verstoorder van de ordo: Gottschalk van Orbais en zijn leer van de dubbele predestinatie," *Utrechtse historische cahiers* 16 (1995), pp. 115–31; and Chazelle, *Crucified God*, pp. 165–208.

⁶⁸ Epperlein, *Herrschaft*, pp. 187–96; Jürgen Weitzel, "Die Normalität als Frage an das Schicksal des Gottschalk von Orbais," in *Religiöse Devianz. Untersuchungen zu sozialen, rechtlichen und theologischen Reaktionen auf religiöse Abweichung im westlichen und östlichen Mittelalter*, ed. Dieter Simon (Frankfurt, 1990), pp. 211–29; and id., "'Oblatio puerorum.' Der Konflikt zwischen väterlicher Gewalt und Selbstbestimmung im Lichte eines Instituts des mittelalterlichen Kirchenrechts," in *Vom mittelalterlichen Recht zur neuzeitlichen Rechtswissenschaft. Bedingungen, Wege und Probleme der europäischen Rechtsgeschichte. Winfried Trusen zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Norbert Brieskorn, Paul Mikat, Daniela Müller, and Dietmar Willoweit (Paderborn, 1994) pp. 59–74; Mayke de Jong, *In Samuel's Image: Child Oblation in the Early Medieval West* (Leiden, 1996), pp. 77–91; and Steffen Patzold, "Konflikte im Kloster Fulda zur Zeit der Karolinger," *Fuldaer Geschichtsblätter* 76 (2000), pp. 69–162.

⁶⁹ Epperlein, *Herrschaft*, pp. 197–245; Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 115–54; Schrimpf, "Hrabanus," pp. 164–74; Ganz, "Debate," pp. 283–302; Diem, "Een verstoorder," pp. 115–31; Chazelle, *Crucified*, pp. 165–208; Warren Pezé, "Autorité royale et controverses théologiques sous Charles le Chauve (840-877)," *Hypothèses, revue de l'école doctorale d'histoire de Paris* 1 (2011), pp. 229–44, here pp. 235–7, who includes Gottschalk's condemnation in a survey of Carolingian doctrinal

the “triune deity” debate of the 850s⁷⁰—or on his poetry.⁷¹ Consequently, this scholarship neither assesses Gottschalk’s long-term development as an intellectual, nor does it reveal what his unusual case can tell us about Carolingian imperial religion or early medieval history in general. Those examinations of Gottschalk that have attempted to account for his life and thought as a whole are either out of date, offer only a cursory analysis, or do not connect him to broader histories of the rise of western Christendom.⁷²

This book follows a largely chronological order in a series of seven chapters. Chapters 1 and 2 reconstruct Gottschalk’s activities up to the mid-830s before he preached his doctrine of predestination. Chapters 3 and 4 explore the development of Gottschalk’s career and ideas as a theologian and missionary, his trials for heresy, and his interpretation of these events as evidence of his own election and martyrdom as discussed in his confession at the opening of this introduction. Chapters 5, 6, and 7 reconstruct the two decades Gottschalk spent in monastic confinement, where he continued to resist his episcopal superiors and to encourage dissent against his oppressors among sympathetic monks until his death.

To follow Gottschalk and his ideas across the ninth-century landscape is to uncover an extraordinarily complex series of phenomena—identifications, concepts, arguments, and metaphors—all centered on a single human being, and frequently meant to convince contemporaries to share in his experiences and support him or his ideas.⁷³ Early medieval modes of thinking about individuals and collectives were drawn from a common historical repertoire, but we should not assume that these modes produced perceptions that were natural or self-evident. For some time there has been considerable interest among scholars regarding these

controversies; id., “Hérésie, exclusion et anathème,” pp. 175–95; and Robert Kindig, *Ideologie in der Frühscholastik. Eine ideologiekritische Untersuchung der Kontroverse um die gemina praedestinatio des Mönchs Gottschalk von Fulda* (Dissertation, Karl-Franzens-Universität, Graz, 2003), who examines the theological positions in the controversy as a philosopher of ideology criticism.

⁷⁰ Jean Jolivet, *Godescalc d’Orbais et la Trinité* (Paris, 1958); Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 154–86; George Tavad, *Trina deitas: the Controversy between Hincmar and Gottschalk* (Milwaukee, 1996); and Irene van Renswoude and Evina Steinová, “The Annotated Gottschalk: Symbolic Annotation and Control of Heterodoxy in the Carolingian Age,” in *La controverse carolingienne sur la prédestination. Histoire, textes, manuscrits*, ed. Pierre Chambert-Protat, Jérémy Delmule, Warren Pezé, and Jeremy Thompson (Paris, forthcoming, 2016)—I offer special thanks to Irene van Renswoude and Evina Steinová for generously sharing a pre-publication version of this text.

⁷¹ Otto Herding, “Über die Dichtungen Gottschalks von Fulda,” in *Festschrift Paul Kluckhohn und Hermann Schneider gewidmet zu ihrem 60. Geburtstag* (Tübingen, 1948), pp. 46–72; Peter von Moos, “Gottschalks Gedicht *O mi custos*—eine *confessio*,” *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 4 (1970), pp. 201–30 and 5 (1971), pp. 317–58; and Weber, *Die Gedichte*.

⁷² Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, pp. 5–49; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 13–28; Boller, *Gottschalk d’Orbais*, pp. 57–101; and Genke, *Gottschalk and a Medieval Predestination Controversy*, pp. 7–63, which is the most comprehensive of these shorter examinations.

⁷³ On the medieval individual or “self” see: Colin Morris, *The Discovery of the Individual, 1050–1200* (London, 1972); Caroline Walker Bynum, “Did the Twelfth Century Discover the Individual?” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1980), pp. 1–17; John Benton, “Consciousness of Self and Perceptions of Individuality,” in *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Robert Benson and Giles Constable (Harvard, 1982), pp. 263–98; Barbara Rosenwein, “Y avait-il un ‘moi’ au haut Moyen Âge?” *Revue historique* 307 (2005), pp. 31–52; and Walter Pohl, “Introduction: Ego Trouble?” in *ET*, pp. i–xix.

modes of thinking and involvement in political processes, including: the participation in important rituals in the political theater of the court;⁷⁴ the establishment of relationships based on lordship, friendship, and family to connect them on the local and imperial level;⁷⁵ and the development of discourses from the court that defined collective identities.⁷⁶ Scholars examining these areas have uncovered the tensions between continuities and changes in the wider political landscape. Yet what still remains unclear is how individuals—especially clerics and monks—navigated or viewed this complex world over the course of a lifetime. Gottschalk was a supremely self-aware crafter of such perceptions, employing ideas and images that were effective precisely because they were recognizable and meaningful to contemporaries. Gottschalk's case is particularly informative about how much influence an ambitious individual might exercise in the early Middle Ages, since his controversial ideas and doctrine helped to shape some key religious developments of his era.

An older trend in scholarship, originating in the nineteenth century and still surprisingly resilient, was the assumption that Gottschalk's Saxon ethnicity gave his thought a particularly Germanic character.⁷⁷ In the 1930s, nationalist scholars were especially concerned with using Gottschalk's life and thought to understand the relationship between German identity and Christianity, arguing that Gottschalk, as the first "German theologian," demonstrated the earliest synthesis of the "Germanic" with Christianity, and they held him up as an example of how Germans might also be Christian without losing their national character.⁷⁸ A few National Socialist authors even claimed that Gottschalk was an early example of the "nordic" spirit fighting against Christianity, an argument that even the majority of

⁷⁴ Janet Nelson, "Ritual and Reality in the Early Medieval Ordinances," *Studies in Church History* 11 (1975), pp. 41–51; ead., "Inauguration Rituals," in *Early Medieval Kingship*, ed. Peter Sawyer and Ian Wood (Leeds, 1977), pp. 50–71; ead., "Carolingian Royal Ritual," in *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*, ed. David Cannadine and Simon Price (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 137–80; Gerd Althoff, *Family, Friends and Followers: Political and Social Bonds in Medieval Europe*, trans. Christopher Carroll (Cambridge, 2004), here 136–59; id., *Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter: Kommunikation in Frieden und Fehde* (Darmstadt, 1997); Geoffrey Koziol, *Begging Pardon and Favor: Ritual and Political Order in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca: NY, 1992), which deals with the period following the ninth century; and *Rituals of Power from Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Janet Nelson and Frans Theuvs (Leiden, 2000). For a critical response to this approach, see Philippe Buc, *The Dangers of Ritual: Between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory* (Princeton, 2001).

⁷⁵ Althoff, *Family*, pp. 1–135; Stuart Airlie, "The Aristocracy," in *NCMH*, pp. 431–50; and Matthew Innes, *State and Society in the Early Middle Ages: The Middle Rhine Valley, 400–1000* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 5–9, 51–93, and 251–9.

⁷⁶ Mary Garrison, "The Franks as the New Israel?" in *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Yitzhak Hen and Matthew Innes (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 114–61; de Jong, "Religion," pp. 148–61; ead., "Charlemagne's," pp. 103–35; David Pratt, *The Political Thought of King Alfred the Great* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 130–78; Noble, "Secular Sanctity," pp. 8–36; Paul Kershaw, *Peaceful Kings: Peace, Power and the Early Medieval Political Imagination* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 132–240; and Helmut Reimitz, *History, Frankish Identity and the Framing of Western Ethnicity, 550–850* (Cambridge, 2015).

⁷⁷ Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 88–96; and Freystedt, "Studien," pp. 15–18 and 162–3.

⁷⁸ Dinkler, *Gottschalk*, pp. 41–2 and 51–71; Dörries, "Gottschalk," pp. 670–84; and Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, pp. 5–49.

their contemporaries rejected.⁷⁹ While scholars in the 1950s and 1960s discarded such interpretations,⁸⁰ they nevertheless accepted the Germanic/Christian binary and argued that there was evidence of “germanisch” influence on his thought⁸¹—a position rearticulated even recently.⁸²

Current scholarship views ethnic identities not as fixed, but as frequently redefined “situational constructs” in changing historical conditions.⁸³ In particular, “Germanic” is a problematic category for historians, since the surviving evidence does not support the notion that the various so-called Germanic peoples belonged to a unified cultural and social world in the early medieval period.⁸⁴ Likewise, Christian authors’ literary images of early medieval Germanic pagans as “others” must be treated with circumspection, rendering our historical knowledge of pre-Christian culture limited at best.⁸⁵ Gottschalk’s case demonstrates two important features of early medieval ethnic identity very clearly: first, whether or not an individual identified him- or herself with a particular group depended on whether it was advantageous to do so at a given moment—not on an automatic self-identification with a group; second, particular historical moments of crisis or confrontation could elicit a debate about the meaning of a specific ethnic group’s

⁷⁹ Herbert Grabert, “Ein Mönch wider Kloster und Kirche,” *Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte* 8 (1937), pp. 607–28; Wilhelm Hauer, “Der nordische Geist im frühchristlichen Mittelalter. I. Gottschalk der Sachse,” *Deutscher Glaube* 4 (1937), pp. 232–44; refuted by Dörries, “Gottschalk,” p. 123.

⁸⁰ Herding, “Dichtungen,” pp. 47–8; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 11–12; and Epperlein, *Herrschaft*, pp. 185–6.

⁸¹ Ingeborg Schröbler, “Glossen eines Germanisten zu Gottschalk von Orbais,” *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 77 (1955), pp. 89–111; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 47–56; and Epperlein, *Herrschaft*, pp. 200–1.

⁸² Adolf Martin Ritter, “(Auto-)Biographisches in den Dichtungen Gottschalks des Sachsen?,” in *Scripturus vitam. Lateinische Biographie von der Antike bis in die Gegenwart. Festgabe für Walter Bershin zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Dorothea Walz (Heidelberg, 2002), pp. 407–21, here 411–13; and Boller, *Gottschalk*, pp. 29–30.

⁸³ Herwig Wolfram, *Geschichte der Goten. Entwurf einer historischen Ethnologie* (Munich, 1979); Patrick Geary, “Ethnic Identity as a Situational Construct in the Early Middle Ages,” *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 113 (1983), pp. 15–26; Walter Pohl, “Tradition, Ethnogenese und literarische Gestaltung: eine Zwischenbilanz,” in *Ethnogenese und Überlieferung. Angewandte Methoden der Frühmittelalterforschung*, ed. Karl Brunner and Brigitte Merta (Vienna, 1994), pp. 9–26; Patrick Geary, *The Myth of Nations: The Medieval Origins of Europe* (New York, 2002); Walter Pohl, *Die Völkerwanderung. Eroberung und Integration* (Berlin, 2002); Walter Pohl, “Ethnicity, Theory and Tradition: A Response,” in *On Barbarian Identity: Critical Approaches to Ethnogenesis Theory*, ed. Andrew Gillett (Turnhout, 2002), pp. 221–40; id., “Identität und Widerspruch. Gedanken zu einer Sinnsgeschichte des frühen Mittelalters,” in *Auf der Suche nach den Ursprüngen. Von der Bedeutung des frühen Mittelalters*, ed. id. (Vienna, 2004), pp. 23–36; id., “Aux origines d’une Europe ethnique: Identités en transformation entre antiquité et moyen âge,” in *Annales Histoire, Sciences sociales* 1 (2005), pp. 183–208; and Reimitz, *History*, pp. 1–24.

⁸⁴ Walter Pohl, *Die Germanen* (Munich, 2000); and id., “Germanenbegriff,” pp. 163–84.

⁸⁵ de Jong, “Religion,” pp. 145–8; and James Palmer, “Defining Paganism in the Carolingian World,” *EME* 15 (2007), pp. 402–25. See also: Lutz von Padberg, “Christen und Heiden. Zur Sicht des Heidentums in ausgewählter angelsachsen und fränkischer Überlieferung des 7. und 8. Jahrhunderts,” in *Iconologia Sacra: Mythos, Bildkunst und Dichtung in der Religions- und Sozialgeschichte Alteuropas. Festschrift für Karl Hauck zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. Hagen Keller and Niklaus Staubach (Berlin, 1994), pp. 291–312; and Ian Wood, “Pagan Religion and Superstition East of the Rhine from the Fifth to the Ninth Centuries,” in *After Empire: Towards an Ethnology of Europe’s Barbarians*, ed. G. Ausenda (Woodbridge, 1995), pp. 253–79.

identity. Though Gottschalk's Saxon ethnicity and noble background were of crucial importance early in his career when he appealed to Saxon law in a court case in 829, there is no evidence that Gottschalk or anyone else identified him as a Saxon during the rest of his life. He was described later as a "Gaul" (*gallus*) in order to distinguish him as someone known to have lived around Rheims.⁸⁶

In order to reevaluate those instances in which Gottschalk's Germanic background is allegedly betrayed, it is necessary to identify and analyze the specific sources of inspiration for his ideas. In addition to arguing that his appeal to Saxon law in 829 betrayed the influence of pre-Christian, Germanic culture,⁸⁷ previous scholars have viewed his theological understanding of service to Christ as revealing his sense of Germanic duty to his lord, trying to link in this way his religious thought with ethnic identity.⁸⁸ They also characterized his claim that he would miraculously survive a deadly trial to prove his doctrine as a Germanic judicial ordeal,⁸⁹ and viewed his doctrine of predestination as influenced by Germanic notions of fate (*wurd*).⁹⁰ This study will show something rather different, which is how these cases were influenced by ninth-century developments or ideas rather than by the assimilated aspects of a putative pre-Christian, Germanic culture.⁹¹ For example, recent scholarship has indicated that the concept of fate quite possibly did not exist in pre-conversion northern Europe.⁹² Gottschalk's inspiration for his ordeal seems to have been a miracle story about the early church martyrs, Saints Crispin and Crispinian from nearby Soissons which he sought to emulate. Similarly, Gottschalk's view of service to God was influenced by Carolingian notions of repentance and devotion to Christ as the heavenly king.

Other fragments of Gottschalk's experiences and ideas found in the sources were largely religious, involving emotional expressions of piety, theological concepts and arguments, and relationships with the deity, friends, and enemies—expressions that are intelligible in their historical context like other phenomena of the past.⁹³

⁸⁶ *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 849, ed. Georg Waitz, *MGH SRG* 5 (Hanover, 1883), p. 36.

⁸⁷ Dinkler, *Gottschalk*, pp. 9–12; Dörries, "Gottschalk," pp. 119–20; and Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, pp. 12–17.

⁸⁸ Dinkler, *Gottschalk*, pp. 28–9 and 40–9; Dörries, "Gottschalk," pp. 122–3; and Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, pp. 20–8.

⁸⁹ Dinkler, *Gottschalk*, pp. 18–19; Dörries, "Gottschalk," pp. 120–1; Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, pp. 45–6; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, p. 50; Ritter, "(Auto-)Biographisches," pp. 411–12; and Boller, *Gottschalk*, pp. 29–30.

⁹⁰ Walter Baetke, *Art und Glaube der Germanen* (Hamburg, 1934), pp. 64–5; id. *Christentum und germanische Religion* (Berlin, 1934), p. 28; Walter Elliger, *Gottes- und Schicksalsglauben im frühdeutschen Christentum* (Hamburg, 1935), pp. 10–21; Dinkler, *Gottschalk*, pp. 21–6; Dörries, "Gottschalk," pp. 122–4; and Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, pp. 60–71.

⁹¹ Baetke, *Art und Glaube*; and id., *Christentum*.

⁹² Elliger, *Gottes- und Schicksalsglauben*; Eric Stanley, *Imagining the Anglo-Saxon Past: The Search for Anglo-Saxon Paganism and Anglo-Saxon Trial by Jury* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 85–110; Jerold Frakes, *The Fate of Fortune in the Early Middle Ages* (Leiden, 1988), pp. 83–91; Joseph Trahern, "Fatalism and the Millennium," in *The Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature*, ed. Malcolm Godden and Michael Lapidge (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 160–71; Rudolf Simek, *Dictionary of Northern Mythology*, trans. Angela Hall (Cambridge, 1993), p. 79; and Pratt, *Political*, pp. 295–302.

⁹³ Philip Sheldrake, *Spirituality and History: Questions of Interpretation and Method* (London, 1991), pp. 65–90 and 171–95. See also the various articles in *Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth Century*, ed. Bernard McGinn, John Meyendorff, and Jean Leclercq (New York, 1992).

Investigating these aspects of Gottschalk's experiences means uncovering not only how he developed them from the common resources of the religious culture to which he belonged, but also how he developed them in uncommon, provocative ways.⁹⁴ His use of models from the Bible and elsewhere for self-expression reveal how he carefully selected language and concepts to convey precise emotional and devotional meanings about himself to others.⁹⁵ Following this approach, the analysis here both draws on and departs from previous examinations of Gottschalk's expressions of emotion and piety which investigated the literary and liturgical influences on his hymns and other poetry. Key studies include Peter von Moos' detailed investigation of Gottschalk's poem, *O mi custos*, which he argues was crafted as an Augustinian confession,⁹⁶ and Marie-Luise Weber's commentary on his poetry, which includes analysis of his textual borrowings and resonances.⁹⁷ These two studies were heavily indebted to the work of Otto Herding,⁹⁸ Klaus Vielhaber,⁹⁹ Josef Szövérfy,¹⁰⁰ and Bernhard Bischoff,¹⁰¹ who began exploring textual resonances in Gottschalk's hymns while rejecting the thesis of 1930s scholars like Dinkler,¹⁰² Dörries,¹⁰³ and Kagerah¹⁰⁴ who claimed that Gottschalk's hymns genuinely conveyed his authentic inner experiences.

This study, however, examines Gottschalk's use of shared discourse, metaphors, and imagery within the tradition of ninth-century intellectual relationships and communities, showing how his carefully-crafted and idiosyncratic messages were meant to influence their audiences. Recent studies have examined friendship in the world of Carolingian scholars from a number of perspectives: the tradition of monastic education where lifelong amity frequently developed between teachers and pupils;¹⁰⁵ the ways fellow academics exchanged ideas, texts, and prayers over

⁹⁴ Jean Leclercq, François Vandenbroucke, and Louis Bouyer, *The Spirituality of the Middle Ages*, trans. The Benedictines of Holme Eden Abbey, Carlisle (New York, 1982), pp. 68–94; and André Vauchez, *The Spirituality of the Medieval West from the Eighth to the Twelfth Century*, trans. Colette Friedlander (Kalamazoo, 1993), pp. 7–10.

⁹⁵ Bynum, "Did the Twelfth Century," pp. 1–17; Barbara Rosenwein, "Introduction," in *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, ed. ead. (Ithaca, 1998), pp. 1–8; Mary Garrison, "The Study of Emotions in Early Medieval History: Some Starting Points," *EME* 10 (2001), pp. 243–50; Barbara Rosenwein, "Writing Without Fear about Early Medieval Emotions," *EME* 10 (2001), pp. 229–34; ead., *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (Ithaca, 2006), pp. 26–9; and Mary Garrison, "The Search for the Self: Tuus Albinus, Alcuin: Peevish Egotist or Parrhesiast," in *ET*, pp. 137–52.

⁹⁶ von Moos, "Gottschalks," pp. 206–30 and pp. 317–51.

⁹⁷ Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 189–334.

⁹⁸ Herding, "Dichtungen," pp. 48 and 56–7.

⁹⁹ Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 31–4.

¹⁰⁰ Josef Szövérfy, *Die Annalen der lateinischen Hymnendichtung. Ein Handbuch* (Berlin, 1964), pp. 235–44.

¹⁰¹ Bernhard Bischoff, "Gottschalks Lied für den Reichenauer Freund," in id., *Mittelalterliche Studien. Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte* (Stuttgart, 1967), II, pp. 26–34.

¹⁰² Dinkler, *Gottschalk*, pp. 20–40.

¹⁰³ Dörries, "Gottschalk," pp. 114–16 and 121–4.

¹⁰⁴ Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, pp. 20–8.

¹⁰⁵ Pierre Riché, *Education and Culture in the Barbarian West: Sixth through Eighth Centuries*, trans. John Contreni (Columbia: SC, 1976); Mayke de Jong, "Growing up in a Carolingian Monastery: Magister Hildemar and his Oblates," *Journal of Medieval History* 9 (1983), pp. 99–128; Rosamond McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 212–27, regarding lay education; John Contreni, *Carolingian Learning, Masters and Manuscripts* (Aldershot, 1992); Madge Hildebrandt, *The External School in Carolingian Society* (New York, 1992); Vivien Law, "The Study of

great distances when they could not meet in person;¹⁰⁶ and the relationships between intellectuals and the patrons for whom they wrote.¹⁰⁷ Well-schooled in all of these traditions, Gottschalk continued to operate within this framework, yet as a heretic and outcast who nonetheless frequently communicated with interested readers. As a religious deviant, Gottschalk stands in stark contrast to other monastic scholars and teachers in the early medieval world, so that his case shows how the usual channels of Carolingian communication could be used for subversive ends.

Of all of his relationships, however, Gottschalk described most often the one he had with God. In his hymns, letters, prayers, and other writings, he frequently characterized himself as a humble, repentant servant or client of God. Gottschalk's name in Old High German meant "servant of God" or "client of God."¹⁰⁸ His choice of this image was both a play on his name and was drawn from the long monastic tradition of seeing oneself as God's servant. Gottschalk's relationship with God is examined here in the context of the Carolingian culture of reform, whose concerns included especially the divine cult and the moral behavior of individual Christians.¹⁰⁹ In the monastic setting, where Gottschalk spent his formative years and, indeed, most of his life, this reform involved the development of penitential devotion, in which individuals regularly sang hymns, confessed their sinfulness, and sought to maintain an ongoing state of contrition while praying for their own and

Grammar," in *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 88–110; John Contreni, "The Carolingian Renaissance: Education and Literary Culture," in *NCMH*, pp. 709–57; and id., "The Pursuit of Knowledge in the Carolingian World," in *The Gentle Voices of Teachers: Aspects of Learning in the Carolingian Age*, ed. Richard Sullivan (Columbus: OH, 1995), pp. 106–41.

¹⁰⁶ Patrick McGuire, *Friendship and Community: The Monastic Experience, 350–1250* (Kalamazoo, 1988), pp. 116–33; John Contreni, "The Carolingian School: Letters from the Classroom," in id., *Carolingian*, pp. 81–112; id., "Pursuit," pp. 106–41; Mary Garrison, "The Social World of Alcuin: Nicknames at York and at the Carolingian Court," in *Alcuin of York: Scholar at the Carolingian Court (Proceedings of the Third Germania Latina Conference)*, ed. L.A.J.R. Houwen and Alasdair Andrew MacDonald (Groningen, 1995), pp. 59–79; ead., "Praesagium nomen tibi: The Significance of Name-Wordplay in Alcuin's Letters to Arn," in *Erzbischof Arn von Salzburg*, ed. Meta Niederkorn-Bruck and Anton Scharer (Vienna, 2004), pp. 107–27; and Régine Le Jan, "Le lien social entre Antiquité et haut Moyen Age: l'amitié dans les collections de lettres gauloises," in *Akkulturation: Probleme einer germanisch-romanischen Kultursynthese in Spätantike und frühem Mittelalter*, ed. Dieter Hägermann, Wolfgang Haubrichs, and Jörg Jarnut (Berlin, 2004), pp. 528–46.

¹⁰⁷ Dieter Schaller, "Poetic Rivalries at the Court of Charlemagne," in *Classical Influences on European Culture, 500–1500*, ed. R.R. Bolgar (Cambridge, 1973), pp. 151–7; Donald Bullough, "Aula Renovata: the Carolingian Court before the Aachen Palace," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 71 (1985), pp. 267–301; Peter Godman, *Poets and Emperors: Frankish Politics and Carolingian Poetry* (Oxford, 1987); Mary Garrison, "The Emergence of Carolingian Latin Literature and the Court of Charlemagne (780–814)," in *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 111–40; and ead., "The English and the Irish at the Court of Charlemagne," in *Karl der Grosse und sein Nachwirken: Charlemagne and his Heritage*, ed. P.L. Butzer, M. Kerner, and W. Oberschelp (Turnhout, 1997), pp. 97–123.

¹⁰⁸ Gottschalk's identity as a servant of God is examined in Chapter 2.

¹⁰⁹ Schramm, "Karl der Grosse," pp. 306–45; McKitterick, *Frankish Church*, pp. 1–44; Brown, "The Carolingian Renaissance," pp. 11–28; de Jong, "Charlemagne's," pp. 103–31; and Noble, "Secular," pp. 8–36.

others' forgiveness.¹¹⁰ Gottschalk's penitential devotion, developed from this monastic tradition, was formative in his lifelong concern for his and others' salvation and served as a basis for his conceptualization of key doctrinal issues.

The centrality of penitential devotion to ninth-century history, and Gottschalk's life in particular, brings us most directly to the political aspect of his relationship to God in his interactions with contemporaries. There were intricate connections between penitential displays of humility and power in the ninth century,¹¹¹ which were part of a wider discourse linking piety with political rule.¹¹² Gottschalk framed his relationship to God in terms of penitential devotion and absolute loyalty, urging his friends, followers, and enemies to understand that they risked divine wrath and damnation if they failed to support him. As a figure without high secular or ecclesiastical rank, Gottschalk's case offers an unusual opportunity to explore the relationship between penance and authority in the Carolingian Empire, revealing how spiritual practices formed an essential part of theology as politics on a cosmic scale. Rather than submitting to the bishops at his condemnations, Gottschalk continued to employ the rhetoric of humility and repentance for himself while defending his doctrine of predestination. He persisted in describing himself as God's humble servant and claimed that the demonstration of true humility and repentance was to accept his teaching that divine grace alone could save (rather than a person's own good works). By defining his position through the discourse of humility, Gottschalk drew on traditional moral categories to win the support of monks and clerics after his incarceration, and even cast himself as a miracle-performing holy figure in an era that had largely transformed early medieval notions of individual holiness into corporate ones in service of the regime.¹¹³

¹¹⁰ Leclercq et al., *Spirituality*, pp. 68–94; Donald Bullough, "Alcuin and the Kingdom of Heaven: Liturgy, Theology and the Carolingian Age," in *Carolingian Essays*, ed. Ute-Renate Blumental (Washington: DC, 1983), pp. 1–69, reprinted: id., *Carolingian Renewal: Sources and Heritage* (Manchester, 1991), pp. 161–240; Michael Driscoll, "Penance in Transition: Popular Piety and Practice," in *Medieval Liturgy: A Book of Essays*, ed. Lizette Larson-Miller (New York, 1997), pp. 121–63; id., *Alcuin et la pénitence à l'époque carolingienne* (Münster, 1999), pp. 99–142; Jonathan Black, "Psalm Uses in Carolingian Prayerbooks: Alcuin's *Confessio Peccatorum Pura* and the Seven Penitential Psalms," *Medieval Studies* 65 (2003), pp. 1–56, and id., "Psalm Uses in Carolingian Prayerbooks: Alcuin and the Preface to the *De psalmorum usu*," *Medieval Studies* 64 (2002), pp. 1–60.

¹¹¹ Mayke de Jong, "Power and Humility in Carolingian Society: The Public Penance of Louis the Pious," *EME* 1 (1992), pp. 29–52; ead., "What was Public," pp. 863–902; ead., "Pollution," pp. 145–58; ead., *The Penitential State*, passim but esp. pp. 229–49 and 263–70; and Meens, *Penance*, pp. 123–30.

¹¹² Robert Deshman, "The Exalted Servant: the Ruler Theology of the Prayerbook of Charles the Bald," *Viator* 11 (1980), pp. 385–417; Paul Kershaw, "Illness, Power and Prayer in Asser's *Life of King Alfred*," *EME* 10 (2001), pp. 201–24; Janet Nelson, "The Voice of Charlemagne," in *Belief and Culture in the Middle Ages: Studies Presented to Henry Mayr-Harting* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 76–88; ead., "Charlemagne the Man," in *Charlemagne: Empire and Society*, ed. Joanna Story (Manchester, 2005), pp. 22–37; Scott DeGregorio, "Texts, *Topoi* and the Self: a Reading of Alfredian Spirituality," *EME* 13 (2005), pp. 79–96; Pratt, *Political*, pp. 59–62, 198–209, and 256–63; and Noble, "Secular," pp. 8–36.

¹¹³ Paul Fouracre, "The Origins of the Carolingian Attempt to Regulate the Cult of Saints," in *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages: Essays on the Contribution of Peter Brown*, ed. James Howard-Johnston and Paul Antony Hayward (Oxford, 1999), pp. 143–66.

The methods of engaging with biblical and patristic authors, which Gottschalk and his fellow theologians used in their debates, have been the subject of much recent investigation. Late eighth and ninth century scholars undertook increasingly sophisticated efforts to engage with biblical and patristic works,¹¹⁴ and these activities fueled heated doctrinal disputes.¹¹⁵ Although biblical texts provided the Word of God and patristic ones interpreted it, both bodies of writing contained endless complexity and countless contradictions that required much explication on the part of ninth-century readers.¹¹⁶ Yet however freely they interpreted and manipulated textual authorities, all Carolingian scholars claimed that they were preserving the immaculate tradition of church teachings given by Christ to the Apostles and then safeguarded by the fathers and councils up to their time.¹¹⁷

Gottschalk, in particular, was a key figure in the ninth-century reception of Augustine's thought. Analysis of the manuscript evidence reveals the intense ninth-century efforts to copy and edit Augustine's works,¹¹⁸ while numerous theologians like Gottschalk tried to come to terms with the intricacies of Augustine's ideas (which changed over time) through a sustained engagement with his massive corpus, in the process discovering "multiple Augustines."¹¹⁹ Rather than investigating Gottschalk either as a representative of Augustine's "extreme" views on predestination¹²⁰ or

¹¹⁴ John Contreni, "Carolingian Biblical Studies," in *Carolingian Essays: Patristics and Early Medieval Thought: Andrew W. Mellon Lectures in Early Christian Studies*, ed. Uta-Renate Blumenthal (Washington: DC, 1983), pp. 71–98, reprinted in id., *Carolingian*, chap. 5, pp. 71–98; Donald Bullough, "Roman Books and Carolingian *Renovatio*," in id., *Carolingian Renewal: Sources and Heritage* (New York, 1991), pp. 123–60; Brown, "Carolingian," pp. 28–51; Contreni, "Carolingian Renaissance," pp. 709–57; John Contreni, "Carolingian Biblical Culture," in *Iohannis Scottus Eriugena: The Bible and Hermeneutics*, ed. C. Steel, J. McEvoy, and G. Van Riel (Leuven, 1996), pp. 1–23; Celia Chazelle and Burton van Name Edwards, "Introduction: The Study of the Bible and Carolingian Culture," in *The Study of the Bible in the Carolingian Era*, ed. ead. and id. (Turnhout, 2003), pp. 1–18; and Martin Claussen, *The Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the Regula Canoniorum in the Eighth Century* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 1–7 and 114–205.

¹¹⁵ Ganz, "Theology," pp. 758–85; and Chazelle, *Crucified*, pp. 14–74 and 165–238.

¹¹⁶ Contreni, "Biblical Studies," pp. 71–98; id., "Biblical Culture," pp. 1–23; and Otten, "Texture," pp. 3–50.

¹¹⁷ Ganz, "Theology," pp. 758–62 and 783–5; Otten, "Texture," pp. 3–9; and Claussen, *The Reform of the Frankish Church*, pp. 1–7.

¹¹⁸ Michael Gorman, *The Manuscript Traditions of the Works of St. Augustine* (Florence, 2001); for a good example of Gorman's approach, see in particular id., "Eugippius and the Origins of the Manuscript Tradition of St. Augustine's '*De Genesi ad Litteram*,'" pp. 7–30, which illustrates the complex transmission history of just one of the church father's key works.

¹¹⁹ Jocelyn Hillgarth, "L'Influence de la 'Cité de Dieu' de saint Augustin au Haut Moyen Âge," *Sacris Erudiri* 28 (1985), pp. 5–34; Eligius Dekkers, "Sur la diffusion au Moyen Âge des œuvres moins connues de saint Augustin," *Homo spiritualis: Festgabe für Luc Verheijen OSA zu seinem 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Cornelius Mayer and Karl Heinz Chelius (Würzburg, 1987), pp. 446–59; id., "Quelques notes sur des florilèges augustinieniens anciens et médiévaux," *Augustiniana* 40–1 (1990), pp. 24–44; Ganz, "Debate," pp. 283–302; Contreni, "Biblical Culture," pp. 1–23; Ganz, "Theology," pp. 758–85; and John Contreni, "Carolingian Era, Early," in *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopaedia*, ed. Allan Fitzgerald et al. (Grand Rapids: MI, 1999), pp. 124–9. For a similar examination for the period up to Gregory the Great, see Conrad Leyser, *Authority and Asceticism from Augustine to Gregory the Great* (Oxford, 2000).

¹²⁰ Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 94–6; Freystedt, "Studien," pp. 15–18 and 162–3; von Schubert, *Geschichte*, p. 48; Benoît Lavaud, "Précurseur de Calvin ou témoin de l'Augustinisme? Le cas de Gotescalc," *Revue Thomiste* 15 (1932), pp. 71–101; Dinkler, *Gottschalk*, pp. 44–6; Dörries, "Gottschalk," pp. 121–4; D. Kadner, "Aus den neuentdeckten Traktaten des Mönches Gottschalk,"

simply as a theologian who further developed them,¹²¹ the approach taken here explores the complex and nuanced ways he assimilated the ideas, texts, and authority of Augustine and other authors to his own theological arguments. As a result of his deep study of, and identification with Augustine's thought, Gottschalk's predestination doctrine intensified the investigation of the church father's writings among other Carolingian scholars during the debates of the 840s and 850s.

This approach has been influenced by recent scholarship on the Carolingian engagement with patristic thought, including work on Hrabanus' and Hincmar's use of textual authorities,¹²² as well as other scholarship that has shown how Carolingian theologians engaged with biblical and patristic texts on their own terms.¹²³ While ninth-century authors saw both as authorities, they nonetheless excerpted them in order to employ them both ruthlessly and adroitly to suit their own arguments, sometimes taking them completely out of context, thereby developing ways of thinking orthodox doctrine through their textual assemblages. In the process, these revered authorities were gathered up and made to serve the needs of ninth-century thought.¹²⁴ Carolingian scholars often adopted large portions of their texts without citation, using the fathers' words to speak and argue for them, as Alcuin did with Augustine's work in his treatise on the Trinity.¹²⁵ They also characterized their patristic sources as authorities espousing their own ninth-century doctrines, in effect transforming ancient authors into Carolingian theologians.¹²⁶

As the Carolingian Empire's signature heretic, Gottschalk's case is important for encouraging a discussion of religious dissent and ecclesiastical authority in early medieval Europe. By focusing on Gottschalk's life and thought, it is possible to challenge further the older, teleological narrative in which Christianization and imperialism led to the development of a benevolent and enlightened European civilization, a narrative that has continued to frame Carolingian studies despite many developments in the field. *Heresy and Dissent in the Carolingian Empire* explores Gottschalk's creative use of controversy and resistance as ways of subverting and disrupting hierarchical power and ecclesiastical correction, sometimes even while being overwhelmed by those coercive forces. For Gottschalk, to be a heretic

Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 61 (1942), pp. 348–58; Mitterauer, *Gottschalk*, pp. 2, 7, and 77–94; and Dennis E. Nineham, "Gottschalk of Orbais: Reactionary or Precursor of the Reformation?" *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 40 (1989), pp. 1–18, here 3–4, and 11–12.

¹²¹ Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, pp. 28–30 and 50–77; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 64 and 68–74; Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine 3: The Growth of Medieval Theology (600–1300)* (Chicago, 1978), pp. 80–95; and Chazelle, *Crucified*, pp. 172–81.

¹²² Maria Rissel, *Rezeption antiker und patristischer Wissenschaft bei Hrabanus Maurus. Studien zur karolingischen Geistesgeschichte* (Frankfurt am Main, 1976); and Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 1239–393.

¹²³ Ganz, *Corbie*, pp. 68–102; John Cavadini, "The Sources and Theology of Alcuin's *De Fide Sanctae et Individuae Trinitatis*," *Traditio* 46 (1991), pp. 123–43; Lawrence Nees, *A Tainted Mantle: Hercules and the Classical Tradition at the Carolingian Court* (Philadelphia, 1991), here 21–143; and Otten, "Texture," pp. 3–50. See also Contreni, "Carolingian Era," pp. 124–9.

¹²⁴ Coon, *Dark Age Bodies*, pp. 42–68 and Claussen, *The Reform of the Frankish Church*, pp. 1–7.

¹²⁵ Cavadini, "Sources," pp. 123–43.

¹²⁶ Otten, "Texture," pp. 9–24; and John Cavadini, "A Carolingian Hilary," in *The Study of the Bible in the Carolingian Era*, ed. Celia Chazelle and Burton van Name Edwards (Turnhout, 2003), pp. 133–40.

in the Carolingian Empire was, contrastingly, to be one of God's elect and a martyr persecuted by heretical earthly powers—a perspective for current scholarship that could open up new avenues for investigating and debating what was at stake historically in this period. By foregrounding a religious outlaw, this study also suggests that less-visible historical forces of resistance could provide us with alternative and critical views of the dominant forms of early medieval and especially Carolingian Christianity. Correspondingly this study of Gottschalk helps introduce the Carolingian world into the broader, ongoing scholarly discussion of religious coercion and dissent during the Middle Ages and beyond.

1

A Monk Against His Abbot, 829

Gottschalk's public debut in the Carolingian world was nothing short of extraordinary. Before the assembled bishops at the Synod of Mainz, 829, he accused his abbot, Hrabanus Maurus, of coercing him as a boy to take the monastic vow and violently tonsuring him at the monastery of Fulda. Despite Hrabanus' furious protests, the bishops ruled against him: they absolved Gottschalk of his vow and allowed him to depart the synod with his liberty restored. This was a remarkable event and one of the bitterest humiliations of Hrabanus' life, one which earned Gottschalk his former abbot's undying enmity. The extant sources for the synod are few in number and problematic to interpret, and therefore contextualizing them in the events of the late eighth and early ninth centuries is critical for understanding how Gottschalk won key allies within his own monastery and among the bishops at the synod, all of whom provided him with the necessary support for obtaining a hearing and recovering his freedom. Building on previous scholarship, this chapter argues overall that Gottschalk was released from his vow because the bishops determined Hrabanus had illegally deprived him of his liberty as a nobleman by forcing him to accept the monastic life of service.¹ Unfortunately, none of Gottschalk's own surviving writings mentions the synod, yet a careful reading—a reading that includes examining Hrabanus' hostile, anti-Gottschalk writing “against the grain”—will make it possible to uncover why Gottschalk's allies supported him. In particular, this process means exploring what the case meant to his allies by considering some of the more coercive features of Frankish imperial Christianity: the history of the Frankish conquest of Saxony and the forced conversion of the Saxons, the reform of child oblation and forced monastic conversion in the 810s, and controversies in Fulda's recent past over the treatment of oblates and monks there. In seeking to understand why Gottschalk's supporters helped him, his case becomes a window into these darker aspects of Frankish history, while simultaneously revealing how groups and individuals resisted the forceful and often punitive tendencies within the empire in order to protect themselves and their allies from harm.

¹ Previous scholarship includes: Eckhard Freise, “Studien zum Einzugsbereich der Klostergemeinschaft von Fulda,” in *Die Klostergemeinschaft von Fulda im früheren Mittelalter*, ed. Karl Schmidt (Munich, 1978), II, pp. 1003–216, here 1017–29; de Jong, *Samuel's Image*, pp. 77–91; Weitzel, “‘Oblatio,’” pp. 59–74; and Patzold, “Konflikte,” pp. 140–53.

GOTTSCHALK AT THE SYNOD OF MAINZ, 829

Sometime before Charlemagne's death in 814, Gottschalk was given as a child oblate to Fulda along with a land donation as a *pro memoria* gift for his deceased father, the Saxon count Berno.² Child oblation, or the giving of a boy to a monastery along with a gift of land, had become the common way for male individuals to enter monasteries in the Carolingian period as well as a strategy for families to establish spiritual ties with these religious institutions.³ During his *pueritia* or before he was of the age of understanding, Gottschalk was allegedly forced by Hrabanus to take the monastic vow and tonsured against his will.⁴ He remained at Fulda until 829 except for a few years in the 820s when he was at the monastery of Reichenau, where he studied under Wetti and met a lifelong friend, Walahfrid Strabo.⁵ Gottschalk appears on memorial lists from Fulda in 822 and 825/826 and from Reichenau in 827/828, indicating that the monks of those monasteries prayed for him during those times as a member of their community.⁶ At Fulda Gottschalk probably sought the favor of Hrabanus, who later accused him of being ungrateful (*ingratus*) for the nurturing he received there as a boy.⁷ Reading Hrabanus' strong response to Gottschalk's demands to leave, Mayke de Jong has suggested that Gottschalk was Hrabanus' favorite pupil at Fulda.⁸ Hrabanus complained in 829 that Gottschalk wanted to achieve rank beyond his station, implying that Gottschalk's motives for leaving Fulda were to pursue a clerical career.⁹ Gottschalk's break with Hrabanus at the Synod of Mainz was unprecedented and went fundamentally against social expectations: teacher–pupil relationships were central to intellectual life throughout the eighth and ninth centuries, and anyone hoping to have a clerical career needed to maintain influential allies and

² Freise, "Studien," pp. 1024–6 and Schmidt, *Klostergemeinschaft*, I, pp. 245–6. The gift is recorded in the Saxon cartulary of Fulda; see: *Traditiones et Antiquitates Fuldenses*, ed. Friedrich Dronke (Fulda, 1844), p. 97. de Jong, *Samuel's Image*, pp. 77–8, 82, and 85, suggests that Gottschalk's mother gave him to Fulda. The date of Gottschalk's birth is unknown, but since he was given as an oblate to Fulda during Charlemagne's reign he was most likely born in the early 800s.

³ de Jong, *Samuel's Image*, pp. 56–73.

⁴ *MGH Conc.* II, No. 50, [Mainz], p. 603. On the history of Fulda in this period, see Schmidt, *Klostergemeinschaft* and, more recently, Janneke Raaijmakers, *The Making of the Monastic Community of Fulda, c.744–c.900* (Cambridge, 2012). On Carolingian monasticism, see Mayke de Jong, "Carolingian Monasticism: the Power of Prayer," in *NCMH*, pp. 622–53; Coon, *Dark Age Bodies*; the articles of Josef Semmler, including especially "Karl der Grosse und das fränkische Mönchtum," in *Karl der Grosse. Lebenswerk und Nachleben, Bd. II: Das Geistige Leben*, ed. Bernhard Bischoff and Wolfgang Braunsfels (Düsseldorf, 1965), pp. 255–89; and Friederich Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich* (Darmstadt, 1988).

⁵ Schmidt, *Klostergemeinschaft*, I, pp. 245–6; Freise, "Studien," p. 1026; de Jong, *Samuel's Image*, pp. 78–9; Gottschalk, *Responsa de diversis*, *CEG*, p. 170; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, p. 14; and Weber, *Die Gedichte*, pp. 246–54.

⁶ Schmidt, *Klostergemeinschaft*, I, pp. 218, 219–20, and 228; and de Jong, "Carolingian Monasticism," pp. 647–51.

⁷ Hrabanus Maurus, *Liber de oblatione puerorum*, *PL* 107: 419–40, here 419.

⁸ de Jong, *Samuel's Image*, pp. 89–90.

⁹ Hrabanus, *Liber*, *PL* 107: 419; Freise, "Studien," p. 1026; and Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, p. 13.

eschew making prominent enemies.¹⁰ Nevertheless, stymied by his abbot, Gottschalk seems to have found an ally and a crucial link to the outside world in Hatto, a fellow Fulda monk, who years before had journeyed to Tours with Hrabanus on Abbot Ratgar's orders to study with Alcuin and who later became abbot of Fulda (842–56).¹¹

Gottschalk's dispute with Hrabanus happened at a time when the Carolingian Empire was undergoing a moment of political and spiritual turmoil.¹² While little is known about the synod besides the fact that Gottschalk's hearing occurred there, it was one of four councils organized by Louis the Pious and his leading advisors for the reform of the church and especially the reform of the clergy's morals (*mores*), way of life (*conversatio*), and actions (*actiones*).¹³ Of particular importance in 829 was the fear that imperial officials had stirred up divine wrath by abusing their authority (*ministerium*), an event made manifest in military defeats at the hands of non-Christian armies in Pannonia and Spain in 827, for which the influential magnates Matfrid and Hugh were deprived of their *honores* and banished from court.¹⁴ This moment of crisis and correction designed to eliminate evils from the realm happened after a decade in which episcopal power, frequently focused on correction, increased dramatically in the empire.¹⁵ The bishops' decision in favor of Gottschalk, therefore, suggests that the circumstances of the crisis of 827–9 seemed to speak to his particular case: Hrabanus, abbot of the royal abbey of Fulda, had abused his imperial ministry by depriving the noble Gottschalk of his liberty.

The sources for the Synod of Mainz are limited to excerpts and paraphrases of no longer extant letters written by Hatto and Hrabanus, which were collected and printed in the seventeenth century by Matthias Flacius Illyricus and his collaborators in their *Historia ecclesiastica*, and one surviving work, Hrabanus' *Liber de oblatione puerorum*.¹⁶ Evidence taken from Hatto's letters to Archbishop Otgar of Mainz, providing details of Gottschalk's circumstances and his keen interest in the young monk's fate, suggests that he probably asked the archbishop to hear Gottschalk's case, which subsequently happened in 829.¹⁷ As has been argued by earlier scholars,¹⁸ the *Liber* seems to have been Hrabanus' riposte to the synod's

¹⁰ Mayke de Jong, "From *Scolastici* to *Scioli*: Alcuin and the Formation of an Intellectual Elite," in *Alcuin of York: Scholar at the Carolingian Court*, ed. L. Houwen and A. MacDonald (Groningen, 1998), pp. 45–58.

¹¹ Epperlein, *Herrschaft*, pp. 191–2; Freise, "Studien," p. 1027; and de Jong, *Samuel's Image*, p. 79.

¹² de Jong, *Penitential*, pp. 148–84; and Moore, *Sacred Kingdom*, pp. 329–37.

¹³ *MGH Cap.* II, No. 184, pp. 2–3. On the synods of 829, see also Mayke de Jong, "Ecclesia and the Early Medieval Polity," in *Staat im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Stuart Airlie, Walter Pohl, and Helmut Reimitz (Vienna, 2006), pp. 113–32, here 129–31.

¹⁴ de Jong, *Penitential*, pp. 37–9; and Costambeys et al., *Carolingian World*, pp. 213–18.

¹⁵ Patzold, *Episcopus*, pp. 105–84; and Moore, *A Sacred Kingdom*, pp. 314–24.

¹⁶ Much of the evidence is collected in *MGH Conc.* II, No. 50 [Mainz, 829], pp. 603–5, reprinted from *Epistolarum Fuldensium fragmenta*, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 519–20 and 529, which was printed from Matthias Flacius Illyricus, *Historia ecclesiastica* (Basel, 559–72), here: cent. 9, col. 271 and 404–5, and cent. 10, col. 585; Hrabanus Maurus, *Liber de oblatione puerorum*, *PL* 107: 419–40; and de Jong, *Samuel's Image*, p. 80, who discusses the manuscripts for the *Liber*.

¹⁷ *MGH Conc.* II, No. 50 [Mainz, 829], pp. 603–5, esp. p. 605.

¹⁸ For a discussion of Hrabanus' text, see de Jong, *In Samuel's Image*, pp. 80–6.

decision to award Gottschalk his freedom, since, though it does not mention Gottschalk by name, it concerns a particular monk who wanted to leave the monastery and who was supported by Saxon “notables” (*primates*).¹⁹ As will become evident, Saxon noble bishops constituted an important element at the Synod of Mainz, suggesting very strongly that the *Liber* was written in response to the bishops’ ruling. The *Liber* was directed at convincing the emperor to overturn the bishops’ decision later that year at an assembly at Worms by warning the court that the legal arguments made by Gottschalk and accepted by the bishops were heretical. This theological aspect of the *Liber* also made the work useful for frightening into submission any other troublesome Fulda monks interested in following Gottschalk’s example.

At the Synod of Mainz, Gottschalk sought his freedom and the return of his *haereditas*.²⁰ Based on the paraphrases of their letters, Hatto seems to have asked Otgar to see that Gottschalk recovered his land, while Hrabanus both reminded the archbishop that Fulda’s properties were actually imperial possessions (since the monastery enjoyed royal patronage) and expressed his fears that Fulda might lose some of those lands.²¹ The *Historia ecclesiastica* provides the following picture of the assembly using evidence taken from Hatto’s and Hrabanus’ letters:

In the year of the Lord 829, in the sixteenth year of Louis’ rule, in the month of June a synod was held at Mainz in the chapter of the canons in the basilica of the Martyr Alban. There gathered Otgar, Archbishop of the same Church of Mainz, Archbishop Hetto [of Trier], Archbishop Hadubald [of Cologne], Archbishop Bernwin [of Besançon], Archbishop Adalrham [of Salzburg], Bishop Drogo [of Metz], Bishop Bernold [of Strasbourg], Bishop Benedict [of Speyer], Bishop Nidgar [of Augsburg], Bishop Folcuic [of Worms], Bishop Wolfleoz [of Constance], Bishop Adaling [of Eichstadt], Bishop Badurad [of Paderborn], Bishop Wolfgar [of Würzburg], Bishop Harud [of Verden], Bishop Theotgrin [of Halberstadt], Bishop Hildi [of Verdun], Bishop Frothar [of Toul], Bishop Waldgoz [of Liège], Bishop Williric [of Bremen], Bishop Frideric [of Maastricht], Bishop Gerfrid [of Münster], Bishop Gebboin [of Osnabrück], Bishop David [of Lausanne], Bishop Udalric [of Basel], Bishop Hitto [of Freising], Bishop Baturic [of Regensburg], Bishop Reginheri [of Passau], Bishop Arbeo [of Bressanone], Chorbishop Humbert, Chorbishop Eburaccar, Chorbishop Wolfgrin, Chorbishop Manno, Abbot Hrabanus [of Fulda], Abbot Sigimar [of Murbach], Abbot Winibert [of Schuttern], Abbot Sindolt [of Ellwangen], Abbot Albuin [of Mattigau (?)] and Abbot Theotger [of Herrieden]. Gottschalk, son of the Saxon count Berno, sued his abbot, Hrabanus, asserting that he had been unwillingly tonsured and violently enslaved to the monastic life by him. Thus, after the matter had been debated in the meeting of the bishops according to divine and human law with diligent effort, he, who had made the accusation, was found to be absolved [of his monastic oath] by canonical authority. And by their judgment he was restored to his paternal freedom with the following rationale: if it should please the abbot, that his [Gottschalk’s] and his relatives’

¹⁹ Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 431–2. Freise, “Studien,” p. 1022.

²⁰ Freise, “Studien,” p. 1021 and de Jong, *Samuel’s Image*, p. 79.

²¹ For evidence from Hatto’s and Hrabanus’ letters see respectively: *MGH Conc.* II, No. 50 [Mainz, 829], p. 605, and *Epistolarum Fuldensium fragmenta*, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 517–33, here 519–20.

oath should be an end to their controversy; that indeed if the abbot should be willing to accept it, he should make compensation according to the law for all of the injury [Gottschalk] suffered, which he caused. If, however, [Hrabanus] should not wish to accept the oath, then let [Gottschalk] not seek compensation for his injuries, but let him simply enjoy his legitimate freedom.²²

The paraphrase is clear that Gottschalk enjoyed his *libertas* after the synod, although whether the dispute was ever settled by Hrabanus paying compensation and Gottschalk making a formal oath, presumably in order to corroborate his claim that Hrabanus had violently tonsured him, is unclear. Some scholars have connected the compensation described in the synod to the question of returning Gottschalk's *haereditas*, although there is no textual basis for doing so.²³ Hatto clearly felt the return of Gottschalk's inheritance was an important issue, though there were no strong legal grounds since Saxon law allowed for the disinheriting of a son as long as the land went to the church or the crown.²⁴ Both applied in Gottschalk's case, since Fulda was a royal abbey.²⁵ Yet a letter Gottschalk wrote to Archbishop Ebbo of Rheims in 831 indicates that he was in possession of his father's property after the synod, which probably means that he regained his inheritance at the Assembly of Worms, where later in 829 the emperor himself could have settled the issue.²⁶

Based on the record of the council's decision and Hrabanus' *Liber*, scholars have speculated about what arguments were made in the case. Eckhard Freise and Jürgen Weitzel, following Hrabanus, have claimed that Gottschalk made a twofold argument at Mainz: first, against child oblation in principle—that free parents could not

²² *MGH Conc.* II, No. 50, [Mainz, 829], p. 604: "Anno Domini 829., imperii Ludovici 16., mense Iunio synodus Moguntii in clauistro basilicae Albani martyris celebratur. Convenerunt Otgarius eiusdem Moguntiacensis ecclesiae archiepiscopus, Hetto arch., Habubald arch., Bernwinus arch., Adalrham arch., Drogo ep., Bernoldus ep., Benedictus ep., Nidgarius ep., Folcuicus ep., Wolfleoz ep., Adalungus ep., Baturatus ep., Wolfgarius ep., Harud ep., Theotgrinus ep., Hildi ep., Frotharius ep., Walldgoz ep., Williricius ep., Fridericus ep., Gerfridus ep., Gebboinus ep., David ep., Udalricus ep., Hitto ep., Baturicus ep., Reginheri ep., Erbeo ep., Humbertus ep., Eburaccar chorep., Wolfgrinius chorep., Manno chorep., Rabanus abbas, Sigmarus abbas, Winibertus abbas, Sindoltus abbas, Albuinus abbas, Theotgerus abbas. Interpellavit Rabanum abbatem Gottescalcus, filius Berni comitis Saxonis, asserens se et invitum fuisse attonsum et violenter ab eo monasticae vitae mancipatum. Habita ratione cum in conventu sacerdotum secundum divina humanae iura diligenti studio causa discuteretur, inventus est is, qui interpellabat, auctoritate canonica esse solvendus. Ac per hoc eorum iudicio paternae restitutus est libertati, ea tamen ratione ut, si abbati ita placeret, controversiae eorum finis inter eos istius ac propinquorum suorum esset iuramentum; quod quidem si abbas suscipere vellet, omnem ei iniuriam, quam perpersus est, secundum legem componeret; si autem ille iuramentum nollet exigere, nec iste compositionem suae quaereret iniuriae, sed tantum legitima frueretur libertate."

²³ Traube, "Carmina," pp. 708–9, and Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, p. 5. This position was criticized by Epperlein, *Volk*, pp. 187–8.

²⁴ *MGH Conc.* II, No. 50, [Mainz, 829], p. 605; *Lex Saxonum*, in *Leges Saxonum und Leges Thuringorum*, 62, ed. Claudius von Schwerin, *MGH Fontes Iuris Germanici Antiqui* 4 (Hanover, 1918), pp. 7–33, here 32. On the Saxon law, see Heiner Lück, "Lex Saxonum," in *Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde*, ed. Johannes Hoops (Berlin, 2001), pp. 332–6; and Thomas Faulkner, *Law and Authority in the Early Middle Ages: The Frankish Leges in the Carolingian Period* (Cambridge, 2016), pp. 46–83.

²⁵ Raaijmakers, *The Making of the Monastic Community*, pp. 50–5.

²⁶ Gottschalk, *Domino clementissimo*, lines 70–2, ed. Lambot, p. 44.

force their children to become monks—and second, for the power of the personality of the law and consequently his right to have Saxon witnesses at his oblation.²⁷ The passage from the *Liber* dealing with this question states:

For when they hear that the regular oblation for young boys ought to be confirmed by appropriate witnesses . . . they say that over a Saxon no one of the Franks or Romans, or from any other people, although among them he is considered to be noble by birth and honorable by way of life, can be a witness unless he be a Saxon witness. For they say that the law of their nation does not allow that a man summoned from another people serve as a witness: this is an infringement of their liberty.²⁸

The identities of the witnesses must have been known from Gottschalk's *petitio*, which Freise speculates Hrabanus would have brought with him to Mainz to prove the nobility and truthfulness of the witnesses.²⁹ The document, no longer extant, probably revealed that the witnesses had been Franks. Yet Freise and Weitzel simply accept Hrabanus' account of Gottschalk's arguments at face value. Mayke de Jong, however, suggests a different, complex scenario: first, that Gottschalk argued that his oblation had been irregular—since Saxon law required his witnesses to be Saxons—and, second, that he argued that his forced profession and tonsure had been illegal.³⁰ Of the two she proposes that the latter held the most weight with the bishops, who would have been aware of legislation forbidding forced tonsuring.³¹

I would suggest that de Jong's two points—the irregularity of his oblation and the illegal nature of his tonsuring—made up key aspects in a wider argument that Gottschalk and his supporters made so he might escape from Fulda: Hrabanus had abused his authority by forcing an unwilling nobleman to enter into monastic service. Imbedded within this argument was the question of the personality of the law, but especially in the sense of law applying to all elites in the empire, including Saxons. The threads of this argument are to be found in sources crucial to understanding a central feature of Gottschalk's case: his relationships with Hatto and the Saxon episcopate. Indeed, Gottschalk's success at winning the support of Hatto and the bishops at the synod was nothing short of astonishing and can only be understood by an investigation of the history of Fulda, Carolingian monastic reform, and Saxon Christianization. According to the record of the council, six bishops at the council held Saxon sees: Badurad of Paderborn, Wulfgar of Würzburg, Harud of Verden, Williric of Bremen, Gerfrid of Münster, and

²⁷ Freise, "Studien," pp. 1022 and 1027, Weitzel, "Oblatio," p. 69, and Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 431–2.

²⁸ Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 431: "Cum enim audierint regularem oblationem in pueris minoris aetatis, testibus idoneis confirmari debere . . . dicunt quod super Saxonem nullus de Francorum aut Romanorum, aut ex alia qualibet gente, licet inter suos nobilis natu atque honestus conversatione habeatur, nisi Saxo testis esse possit. Hoc enim, aiunt, legem gentis suae pati non posse, ut alterius gentis homo in testimonium citetur ad infringendam legem libertatis suae."

²⁹ Freise, "Studien," p. 1027. Faulkner, *Law and Authority*, pp. 65–6 likewise emphasizes that the absence of Saxon witnesses must have been important in Gottschalk's case.

³⁰ de Jong, *Samuel's Image*, pp. 79–81.

³¹ de Jong, *Samuel's Image*, pp. 79–81.

Gebboin of Osnabrück. Another bishop, Bernold of Strasbourg, was also a Saxon.³² These figures, in particular Badurad, must have lent powerful support to Gottschalk and were quite likely his greatest advocates. Though, as we shall see, they identified with him as Saxon elites, they defended him not only as a Saxon but ultimately as an imperial nobleman. Therefore, establishing why Hatto and the bishops lent Gottschalk their assistance is critical to understanding the place of his case in the wider history of the period.

HATTO, THE HISTORY OF FULDA (800–29), AND MONASTIC LEGISLATION

Without Hatto's invaluable assistance in obtaining a hearing for Gottschalk, the young Saxon monk might have remained at Fulda indefinitely. Few options existed for early ninth-century monks wanting to leave the monastic life after taking their vows. There were anonymous runaway oblates and monks, who fled their cloisters without leave, but little is known about what they did thereafter.³³ Fulda itself had its fair share of runaways in the early ninth century. Such cases are important to this investigation because they show how Gottschalk sought to obtain his freedom through the proper episcopal channels in order to avoid jeopardizing his chances for a career outside Fulda.

Evidence from Hatto's letters to Otgar reveals that two issues provided good grounds for a hearing: that Gottschalk had been forced to become a monk against his will, and that this had happened during his *pueritia*.³⁴ Hatto's support of Gottschalk is indicated by a paraphrase of his letter, stating: "he judged that no one should be forced to become a monk," a point to which his seventeenth-century interpreters agreed.³⁵ Hatto's support for Gottschalk on this issue reflects the tumultuous history of his monastery in the first two decades of the ninth century, when coerced tonsuring and the treatment of oblates had divided the Fulda monks on more than one occasion.³⁶

In 807 discord over the monastery's *pueri* erupted at Fulda following the outbreak of an epidemic that killed numerous brothers. Many of the boys fled the monastery, and Abbot Ratgar blamed the *custos puerorum*, Hrabanus Maurus,

³² Philippe Depreux, *Prosopographie de l'entourage de Louis le Pieux (781–840)* (Sigmaringen, 1997), pp. 140–1.

³³ de Jong, "Carolingian Monasticism," p. 642.

³⁴ *MGH Conc.* II, No. 50, [Mainz, 829], p. 603, reprinted from *Epistolarum Fuldensium fragmenta*, *MGH Epp.* V, p. 529.

³⁵ *MGH Conc.* II, No. 50, [Mainz, 829], p. 603: "In hoc tamen recte sensit (Hatto), quod iudicavit neminem debere invitum fieri monachum . . ."

³⁶ Recent studies on Fulda during this period are Raaijmakers, *Making of the Monastic Community*, pp. 99–131, Patzold, "Konflikte," pp. 105–40, and Johannes Fried, "Fulda in der Bildungs- und Geistesgeschichte des früheren Mittelalters," in *Kloster Fulda in der Welt der Karolinger und Ottonen*, ed. Gangolf Schrimpf (Frankfurt am Main, 1996), pp. 3–38.

for tormenting the young with frequent invectives and abuse.³⁷ Hrabanus, who had been a child oblate himself, may have demanded that the *pueri* remain at Fulda against their will, perhaps even forcing them—like Gottschalk—to take their vows in order to prevent their departure.³⁸ While Abbot Ratgar's rule at Fulda divided the monastery over a number of issues, and Hrabanus later described him as a hard and cruel abbot,³⁹ Ratgar's accusation of Hrabanus suggests a history of heavy-handed discipline with the boys in the monastery even before Gottschalk's tonsuring—a feature of the upbringing of oblates in Carolingian cloisters that does not seem to have been unique to Hrabanus.⁴⁰

In 812 there was a great *conturbatio* in the monastery, and Ratgar and twelve of his monks went to Mainz, where Charlemagne and a group of three bishops attempted to resolve the differences.⁴¹ The Fulda brothers outlined their complaints against the abbot in a work called the *Supplex libellus* and presented it to Charlemagne, hoping he would intercede for them.⁴² The brothers complained that Ratgar was acting like a tyrant, bullying the brothers, creating a sense of discord at the monastery, and forcing some (the language is not specific about the victims' age) to become monks against their will.⁴³ Since monks at this time generally entered the monastery in their youth, it seems likely that the *Supplex* refers to at least some who had come to Fulda before adulthood.⁴⁴ The brothers felt that unwilling monks, who had not made their vows out of devotion, tended to corrupt the others and disturbed the quality of spiritual life at Fulda.⁴⁵ The dissension there continued despite Charlemagne's intervention, and the dissident monks and *pueri* left the monastery or were forced into exile by the abbot.⁴⁶ Following Charlemagne's death, the monks complained again to Louis the Pious in 816 and Ratgar was deposed in 817 by his command.⁴⁷

When Gottschalk argued that as a boy his vow was coerced and his tonsure forced, he stressed issues that had once divided the Fulda community bitterly and

³⁷ *Chronicon Laurissense breve*, s.a. 807, ed. Hans Schnorr von Carolsfeld, *Neues Archiv* 36 (1910/1911) pp. 15–39, here 37. On this text, and the identification of Hrabanus with the *custos*, see Richard Corradini, *Die Wiener Handschrift Cvp 430*. Ein Beitrag zur Historiographie in Fulda im frühen 9. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt am Main, 2000), pp. 37–46.

³⁸ On Hrabanus as a child oblate, see de Jong, *Samuel's Image*, pp. 73–7, and p. 81, where she speculates that tonsuring oblates may have been common practice at Fulda.

³⁹ Patzold, "Konflikte," pp. 118–23.

⁴⁰ Coon, *Dark Age Bodies*, pp. 87–8; and de Jong, "Growing up," pp. 106–8 and 110–19.

⁴¹ *Chronicon Laurissense*, s.a. 812, ed. von Carolsfeld, p. 38.

⁴² *Supplex libellus*, ed. Joseph Semmler, in *Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum. Tomus I Initia Consuetudinis Benedictinae Consuetudines Saeculi Octavi et Noni*, ed. Kassius Hallinger (Siegburg, 1963), pp. 319–27. See also Raaijmakers, *Making of the Monastic Community*, pp. 119–22.

⁴³ *Supplex libellus*, ed. Semmler, pp. 326–7.

⁴⁴ De Jong, *Samuel's Image*, pp. 56–68, and ead., "Carolingian monasticism," pp. 640–4.

⁴⁵ On the fear of corrupt adults entering the monastery, see de Jong, "Growing up," pp. 105–6.

⁴⁶ Raaijmakers, *Making of the Monastic Community*, pp. 114, 117, and 130, and Corradini, *Wiener Handschrift*, p. 78. See also Candidus, *Vita Eigilis abbatis Fuldensis*, 5, ed. Georg Waitz, *MGH SS* 15 (Hanover, 1887), pp. 221–33, here 224; and Hrabanus Maurus, *Metrum de transitu monachorum*, *PLAC* II, pp. 204–5.

⁴⁷ Raaijmakers, *Making of the Monastic Community*, pp. 126–30, and Patzold, "Konflikte," pp. 124–39.

resonated with Hatto and perhaps others. Yet the bishops at the Synod of Mainz in 829 would have known that the issue of forcibly tonsuring men and boys had been widely discussed throughout the entire empire in the first decades of the ninth century. Carolingian legislation in the late eighth and early ninth centuries against coercing unwilling individuals to accept a cloistered life reveals this was a recurrent problem connected with monastic reform in the empire.⁴⁸ By the early ninth century, however, a new difficulty had arisen to complicate matters further: cloisters were filled with large numbers of boys sent to receive an education whose status was unclear.⁴⁹ Because of the numerous different monastic traditions throughout the Carolingian world, the place of such boys in the cloister was uncertain.⁵⁰ In 813 at the Synod of Mainz, the bishops—including five bishops who would be at the Synod of Mainz in 829—ruled that one should only be tonsured when willing and at the legitimate age (meaning not during their *pueritia*).⁵¹ Later that same year Charlemagne and his bishops legislated that boys tonsured without their parents' permission be allowed to appeal to their families, their bishop, or the emperor.⁵² Through this legislation, the regime sought to make it standard that boys be allowed to arrive at the age of decision, and then with their parents' permission choose to adopt a cloistered life. To this end, monasteries worked hard to discipline and educate oblates so that they would remain in the cloister,⁵³ with the result that, as Mayke de Jong has argued, "lip service was paid to the ideal of voluntary entry into monastic life while upholding the irrevocability of child oblation."⁵⁴

One difficulty about child oblates' status facing legislators and abbots alike was that the *Regula Benedicti*, which had been championed in Charlemagne's day as the proper monastic rule, only implied that oblates were to become monks when adults.⁵⁵ As previous scholars have argued, this assumption about an oblate's future was as implicit in the text, since the boys were given as "offerings" (*oblatores*) to the

⁴⁸ On the specific Carolingian legislation, see *MGH Conc.* II, No. 19 [Frankfurt, 794], 16, pp. 165–71, here 168; *MGH Conc.* II, No. 36 [Mainz, 813], 23, pp. 258–72, here 267; *Concordia Episcoporum*, *MGH Conc.* II, No. 36B [813], 12, pp. 297–300, here 298–9; *MGH Conc.* II, No. 46 [Rome, 826], 32, pp. 559–85, here 580; and *MGH Cap.* I, No. 26, 11, pp. 62–4, here 63; and *MGH Cap.* I, No. 72, 10, pp. 162–3, here 163. For a detailed discussion, see de Jong, *Samuel's Image*, pp. 56–68 and 81 regarding Gottschalk's case specifically.

⁴⁹ Contreni, "Carolingian Renaissance," p. 713; and Hildebrandt, *The External School*, pp. 49–99. On lay education in general, see McKitterick, *Written Word*, pp. 212–27, and Riché, *Education*, pp. 177–246 and 421–94.

⁵⁰ On monasteries' defense of their traditions, see Joseph Semmler, "Benedictus II: una regula—una consuetudo," in *Benedictine Culture, 750–1050*, ed. Willem Lourdaux and David Verhelst (Leuven, 1983), pp. 1–49.

⁵¹ *MGH Conc.* II, No. 36 [Mainz, 813], 23, p. 267; and *MGH Conc.* II, No. 50 [Mainz, 829], p. 604; the bishops include: Bernwin of Besançon, Benedict of Speyer, Wulfleoz of Coutances, Wolfgar of Würzburg, Frothar of Toul, Waldgoz of Liège, and Williric of Bremen.

⁵² *MGH Conc.* II, No. 36B [813], *Concordia Episcoporum*, 12, pp. 298–9.

⁵³ On the coercive and nurturing sides of oblate upbringing, see Coon, *Dark Age Bodies*, pp. 87–8, 104, 115, and 156; and de Jong, "Growing up," pp. 101–3, 106–8, and 110–19.

⁵⁴ de Jong, *Samuel's Image*, p. 99.

⁵⁵ On the spread of the *Regula* in the empire, see Prinz, *Mönchtum*, pp. 263–92, and de Jong, *Samuel's Image*, p. 58.

monastery and placed along with their parents' petition on the altar in the cloister's church, as it was in the tradition of Roman law where parents' wishes held greater weight than a child's.⁵⁶ Yet Carolingian legislators spent the 810s attempting to regularize child oblation practices and to forbid the tonsuring of boys and unwilling adults, which suggests in practice that confusion could easily arise in individual cases. The monastic reform movement of the latter part of the 810s sought to regularize Carolingian monasticism through a unified use and interpretation of the *Regula Benedicti*.⁵⁷ In 817 it was legislated that parents should promise that their boy would observe the rule at the age of understanding and that oblates should later confirm their parents' oath and accept tonsure.⁵⁸ Simultaneously, it was ruled that monastic schools be closed to all non-oblates, thus eliminating one significant source of tension and confusion over the future status of *pueri* in the cloister.⁵⁹ Yet the fact that many parents had given oblates to monasteries before 817 without taking the new vows complicated matters, and in 818/819 it was again legislated that boys not be tonsured without their parents' consent.⁶⁰ Gottschalk, who was made an oblate presumably according to his father's last wishes at Fulda years before the new legislation, would have been just such an old case, and this legislation opened the door for him to argue that his treatment at his abbot's hands was not canonical.

BADURAD OF PADERBORN AND THE BISHOPS AS ALLIES: SAXON ETHNICITY AND SECULAR LAW

The Carolingian legislation examined thus far probably proved convincing to the synod. Yet as the son of the Saxon count Berno, Gottschalk's status as a nobleman who had been "violently enslaved" (*violenter mancipatus*) as a monk was also a key factor—especially with the Saxon bishops. Thomas Faulkner stresses that Saxon law was frequently employed to emphasize "social differentiation *within* the Saxon *gens*," which suggests that Gottschalk's nobility and ethnicity probably counted even before the synod gathered among the bishops who saw his case as an opportunity to stress their superior status within Saxony.⁶¹ Badurad of Paderborn in particular was a powerful figure who served Louis the Pious frequently as a *missus* and was related to the royal family.⁶² What is more, Gottschalk and Badurad may

⁵⁶ de Jong, *Samuel's Image*, pp. 26–30 and 60–8, and Weitzel, "Oblatio," pp. 61–8. The relevant passage of the rule is *La Règle de saint Benoît*, 59, ed. Adalbert de Vogüé and Jean Neufville, 7 vols. (Paris, 1971–7), here II, pp. 632–4.

⁵⁷ de Jong, *Samuel's Image*, pp. 630–4 and Semmler, "Benedictus II," pp. 1–49.

⁵⁸ *MGH Cap.* I, No. 170, 36, pp. 344–9, here 346.

⁵⁹ *MGH Cap.* I, No. 170, 36, pp. 344–9, here 346.

⁶⁰ *MGH Cap.* I, No. 138, 20, pp. 275–88, here 278.

⁶¹ Faulkner, *Law and Authority*, p. 83.

⁶² See, for example, Tegan, *Gesta Hludowici imperatoris*, 53, ed. Ernst Tremp, *MGH SSRG* 64 (Hanover, 1995), p. 248. Hedwig Röckelein, *Reliquientranslationen nach Sachsen im 9. Jahrhundert: über Kommunikation, Mobilität und Öffentlichkeit im Frühmittelalter* (Stuttgart, 2002), pp. 52–4; Christopher Carroll, "The Bishoprics of Saxony in the First Century After Christianization," *EME* 8

have even belonged to the same Saxon kin group, the Immedinger, although the existence and significance of such groups is disputed.⁶³ Whether through Hatto's letters or other means, Gottschalk could have come into contact with Badurad, other bishops, or other living relatives, whose influence with Archbishop Otgar would have helped Gottschalk win a hearing.

The inquiry into Gottschalk's case at the synod was one to pass judgment on his legal status and it is clear from the trial account and Hrabanus' *Liber* that the following issues of secular law were considered: *compensatio* for Gottschalk, his Saxon ethnicity, his nobility, and the fact that his oblation witnesses had not been Saxons. The importance of such issues for the case suggests that the Saxon bishops viewed the matter as fellow Saxons whose noble rights were held in common with Gottschalk. Nevertheless, Hrabanus' text refashioned this emphasis on Gottschalk's nobility and ethnicity in an effort to discredit his arguments. The Saxon bishops supporting Gottschalk, however, defended his rights very much as fellow imperial noblemen for whom only voluntary service to the regime was honorable, basing their outlook on the long history of the conversion and cooperation of Saxon elites with the Carolingian dynasty. To demonstrate this point, however, will require a brief digression into the complex development of the Saxon nobility in the late eighth and early ninth centuries.

A key question of Carolingian history is how the Saxon elites were transformed into Carolingian nobles, and, correspondingly, how a Christian culture developed in Saxony.⁶⁴ Other scholars have emphasized the importance of various aspects of this transformation: the missionaries' role in teaching the Saxons how to live as Christians;⁶⁵ the economic and spiritual relationships between Saxon nobles and monasteries, with the latter serving as educational centers;⁶⁶ the translation of relics from Francia and Rome to Saxony that not only "sacralized" the landscape with

(1999), pp. 219–45, here 233 and 236; Franz Tenckhoff, *Die Paderborner Bischöfe von Hathumar bis Rethar (806–1009)* (Paderborn, 1900), pp. 6–19, and id., "Die Beziehungen des Bischofs Badurad von Paderborn zu Kaiser Ludwig und seinen Söhnen," *Westfälische Zeitschrift* 56 (1898), pp. 89–97.

⁶³ Richard Wenskus, *Sächsischer Stammesadel und fränkischer Reichsadel* (Göttingen, 1976), pp. 129–30. On kin groups, see Stuart Airlie, "Aristocracy," in *NCMH*, pp. 431–50; Hans-Werner Goetz, "Social and Military Institutions," in *NCMH*, pp. 451–80; and Schieffer, *Die Zeit des karolingischen Großreichs*, pp. 89–98.

⁶⁴ Forthcoming research from Ingrid Rembold should prove central to this topic.

⁶⁵ Ian Wood, "An Absence of Saints? The Evidence for the Christianisation of Saxony," in *Am Vorabend der Kaiserkrönung*, ed. Peter Godman, Jorg Jarnut, and Peter Johanek (Paderborn, 2002), pp. 335–52; id., *The Missionary Life: Saints and the Evangelisation of Europe, 400–1050* (London, 2001), pp. 79–99; Lutz E. von Padberg, "Zum Sachsenbild in hagiographischen Quellen," in *Studien zur Sachsenforschung* 12, ed. Hans-Jürgen Häßler, Jörg Jarnut, and Matthias Wemhoff (Oldenburg, 1999), pp. 173–91; Wolfert van Egmond, "Converting Monks: Missionary Activity in Early Medieval Frisia and Saxony," in *Christianizing Peoples and Converting Individuals*, ed. Guyda Armstrong and Ian Wood (Turnhout, 2000), pp. 37–45; and Karl Hauck, "Die fränkische-deutsche Monarchie und der Weserraum," in *Die Eingliederung der Sachsen in das Frankenreich*, ed. Walther Lammers (Darmstadt, 1970), pp. 416–50.

⁶⁶ Heinz Löwe, "Lateinisch-christliche Kultur im karolingischen Sachsen," in *Religiosität und Bildung im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Tilman Struve (Weimar, 1994), pp. 46–86; David Appleby, "Spiritual Progress in Carolingian Saxony: A Case from Ninth-Century Corvey," *Catholic Historical Review* 82 (1996), pp. 599–613; and Hans Patze, "Mission und Kirchenorganisation in karolinger Zeit," in *Geschichte Niedersachsens*, ed. id. (Hildesheim, 1985), I, pp. 653–712.

miracles, but also gave occasion for Saxon authors to educate the nobility with hagiographical texts;⁶⁷ the intermarriage of Saxon nobles with their Frankish counterparts;⁶⁸ the role of former Saxon hostages in spreading Christian ideas among their countrymen after a long stay among Frankish hosts;⁶⁹ and the ways authors shaped the memory of the forced Saxon conversion into a “success story” for the Saxon nobility with Charlemagne as their own sword-wielding apostle.⁷⁰ Each of these arguments has contributed to a more nuanced view of the Saxon nobles’ transformation into Christians in the ninth century, although one might still ask how the Saxon nobles’ view of themselves as Carolingian elites developed in the changing world of the late eighth and ninth centuries.

Matthias Becher has argued that during the Saxon wars (772–804) and in the early ninth century the Saxon nobles developed as a group from the families of petty kings who had previously ruled different groups of “Saxons”; Becher claims the Saxons had a very fluid political culture, changing and reforming their political associations frequently.⁷¹ According to the original *Annales regni Francorum*, a multitude of Saxons swore in 777 by their good birth (*ingenuitas*) and their land (*alodes*) that they would remain faithful to Charlemagne, his sons and the Franks, and would accept Christianity.⁷² In 782, Charlemagne established Saxon counts from the “most noble” of them over their native land and thereafter some of the Saxon nobles and their followers fought alongside Frankish troops against other Saxons and attended royal assemblies during the 780s.⁷³ Becher’s analysis of Saxon political culture helps explain the frequent rebellions and conflicts in Saxony in the period—especially in the 790s, when much of Saxony erupted in violence after several years of peace and cooperation with the Carolingian regime.

⁶⁷ Röckelein, *Reliquientranslationen* and Karl Heinrich Krüger, *Studien zur Corveyer Gründungsüberlieferung* (Münster, 2001), pp. 92–5.

⁶⁸ Wenskus, *Sächsischer Stammesadel*.

⁶⁹ Springer, *Sachsen*, pp. 221–13 and Adam Kosto, “Hostages in the Carolingian World (714–840),” *EME* 11 (2002), pp. 123–47, here 142–5.

⁷⁰ von Padberg, “Zum Sachsenbild,” pp. 173–91; Joachim Ehlers, “Die Sachsenmission als heilsgeschichtliches Ereignis,” in *Vita Religiosa im Mittelalter. Festschrift für Kaspar Elm zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Franz Felten and Nikolas Jaspert (Berlin, 1999), pp. 37–53; and Helmut Beumann, “Unterwerfung und Christianisierung der Sachsen durch Karl der Grosse,” in *Cristianizzazione ed organizzazione ecclesiastica delle campagne nell’alto medioevo: espansione e resistenza, 10–16 aprile 1980*, Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di studi sull’alto medioevo 28 (Spoleto, 1982), pp. 129–68.

⁷¹ Matthias Becher, “*Non enim habent regem idem Antiqui Saxones* . . . Verfassung und Ethnogenese in Sachsen während des 8. Jahrhunderts,” in *Studien zur Sachsenforschung* 12 (Oldenburg, 1999), pp. 1–31. For a recent treatment of the Saxon wars, see Springer, *Sachsen*, pp. 178–210. On Saxon social and political institutions in general, see Ian Wood, “Beyond Satraps and Ostriches: Political and Social Structures of the Saxons in the Early Carolingian Period,” in *The Continental Saxons from the Migration Period to the Tenth Century*, ed. David Green and Frank Siegmund (Rochester: NY, 2003), pp. 271–99.

⁷² *Annales regni Francorum*, s.a. 777, ed. Georg Pertz and Friederich Kurze, *MGH SSRG* 6 (Hanover, 1895), p. 48. On the development, dissemination, and message of the Frankish annals, see Rosamond McKitterick, *History and Memory in the Carolingian World* (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 84–119; ead. *Perceptions of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (South Bend: IN, 2006), pp. 63–90; and Reimitz, *History*, pp. 335–45 and 410–43.

⁷³ *Annales Laureshamenses*, s.a. 782, ed. Georg Pertz, *MGH SS* 1 (Hanover 1826), pp. 22–39, here 32. Saxons attended assemblies and fought in campaigns in 785, 787, 788, 789, and 791; see *Annales regni Francorum*, ed. Pertz and Kurze, pp. 68–70, 78, 80, 84, 86, and 88.

While it is disputed to what degree the nobles betrayed their oaths and fought against the Franks in the 790s, there is evidence that some of them remained loyal to Charlemagne and were recognized as important Frankish allies against other Saxons.⁷⁴ Two late charters from Charlemagne's reign demonstrate this point. Amalung, the father of the Saxon count Bennit, and Hiddi, the father of Asig or Adlaric, left Saxony out of loyalty to Charlemagne during the rebellions and received other lands as compensation from the emperor.⁷⁵ In 811 and 813, Charlemagne recalled their loyalty and confirmed their descendants' rights to the properties he had awarded them.

Yet not all cases were as clear as those of Amalung and Hiddi. In the confusion of the fighting, some Saxons must have remained loyal to the king, but because of the circumstances of the conflict they were mistaken for rebels. An example of such a case is that of Richolf and Richart, whose descendants sought Louis the Pious' help in restoring to them their lost property. In a letter from around 815, the anonymous Saxons carefully framed their story to emphasize the hardships that befell their family in Charlemagne's service as loyal Christians.⁷⁶ First, they noted how their uncle, Richolf, was killed with the Saxon counts returning from an embassy to the Danish king in 798.⁷⁷ Then they wrote how their father, Richart, lost his wife and property to Saxon rebels while he was away from home at court. Richart rescued his wife by stealth (*furtim*) and fled with her to her homeland in Marstheim. Then, when numerous Saxons were expelled by Charlemagne to end the rebellions, they were mistakenly deported with the others and had no way to recover their property. Richart died not long after, and their mother had no way to regain her children's *haereditas*.⁷⁸

Saxons such as Richart, Richolf, Amalung, and Hiddi must have been included among the *fideles Saxones* mentioned in the *Capitulare Saxonum* of 797, when Saxon and Frankish elites together participated in the creation of legislation dealing with the Saxon wars and the transformation of Saxony into a part of the Carolingian Empire.⁷⁹ It is possible that Gottschalk's father, count Berno, was among them as well. Saxons who descended from such figures probably viewed themselves as victors in the Saxon wars on the side of Frankish regime, as well as willing Christians rather than as conquered and forcibly converted people. From this development, we can see the formation of a new Christian hierarchy in Saxony among the Saxons themselves, one in which nobility was linked to cooperation with the regime, whereas those coerced into service and the new religion were of a lower order.⁸⁰

⁷⁴ Eric Goldberg, "Popular Revolt, Dynastic Politics, and Aristocratic Factionalism in the Early Middle Ages: the Saxon *Stellinga* Reconsidered," *Speculum* 70 (1995), pp. 476–501, here 472–8; and Carroll, "Bishoprics," pp. 221–2.

⁷⁵ Charters 213 (811) and 218 (813), *Die Urkunden Pippins, Karlmanns und Karls des Grossen*, ed. Engelbert Mühlbacher, *MGH Diplomata I* (Hanover, 1906), pp. 284–5 and 290–1.

⁷⁶ *MGH Epp.* V, No. 2 (Berlin, 1899), pp. 300–1.

⁷⁷ The embassy is recorded in *Annales regni Francorum*, s.a. 798, ed. Pertz and Kurze, pp. 102–5.

⁷⁸ *MGH Epp.* V, No. 2, pp. 300–1.

⁷⁹ *MGH Cap.* I, No. 27, *Capitulare Saxonum*, pp. 71–2.

⁸⁰ On this point, see Goldberg, "Popular Revolt," pp. 470–80.

As Ian Wood has pointed out, the political narrative of this period is difficult to establish.⁸¹ Yet it seems likely that the Saxon nobles developed a sense of being part of the Carolingian elite as a result of their experiences in military campaigns and assemblies, where Saxon legislation outlining the position of the *nobiles* was passed.⁸² A significant part of this development was the new bond between the Carolingian regime and the nobles, established by the oath of 777. This process continued after the Saxon wars, for the annals record Saxon nobles' participation in campaigns and assemblies throughout the first three decades of the ninth century.⁸³ Louis the Pious made a concerted effort to encourage the Saxons to be loyal to him. It is quite likely that pleas, such as that of the descendants of Richart, induced Louis to restore lost Saxon property en masse. In 816 he restored the *haereditas* of Saxons whose fathers legally lost it during the wars for *perfidia*, an act that the anonymous biographer of Louis the Pious known as the Astronomer claimed in the early 840s had proved effective since the Saxons (along with the Frisians) remained most devoted to him throughout his reign.⁸⁴ This loyalty may also have been helped by the fact that in 819 Louis married Judith, whose mother Heilwig was a noble Saxon.⁸⁵ When the royal annals were revised in the early ninth century, the scene of the Saxon oath of 777 was notably changed. Where the original annalist had described the Saxons as a multitude pledging their *ingenuitas* and *alodes*, the redactor wrote that the whole senate and people of the Saxon *gens* (*totus senatus ac populus*) swore on their "freedom and fatherland" (*libertas et patria*) to be loyal.⁸⁶ While the change may reflect the reviser's classicizing tendency, his recognition of a greater Saxon elite and its relationship to the Carolingian regime gives evidence of the new political currents in the early ninth century. The redactor even described the Saxon resistance leader Widukind as "unus ex primoribus" of the Westfalians, while the original annalist simply called him "rebellis."⁸⁷ The switch from *ingenuitas* to *libertas* could also indicate a changing emphasis on the nobles' status as imperial elites. Louis' measures to win the Saxons' loyalty may have helped them interpret the wars as a thing of the past and enabled them to get on with the business of being Carolingian nobles living in the favor of their emperor.

Another of Louis' measures of 816 was later directly related to Gottschalk's hearing. A piece of legislation that probably led Badurad and the Saxon bishops to claim that Gottschalk's oblation had been invalid is located in a capitulary

⁸¹ Wood, "Absence," pp. 335–41.

⁸² Such legislation includes two capitularies: *MGH Cap. I*, No. 26, *Capitulatio de partibus Saxonibus*, pp. 68–70; and *MGH Cap. I*, No. 27, *Capitulare Saxonicum*, pp. 71–2; and the *Lex Saxonum*, ed. von Schwerin, pp. 7–33, which was probably compiled around 802–3. On the Saxon law, see Lück, "Lex Saxonum," pp. 332–6; and Faulkner, *Law and Authority*, pp. 46–83.

⁸³ Saxons fought for the regime and attended its assemblies in 802, 808, 809, 810, 813, 815, 816, 819, 820, 822, 823, and 828; see *Annales regni Francorum*, ed. Pertz and Kurze, pp. 117, 125, 128–9, 131–2, 138, 141, 143–4, 149, 160, and 175.

⁸⁴ Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici imperatoris*, 24, ed. Ernst Tremp, *MGH SSRG* 64 (Hanover, 1995), pp. 356–7.

⁸⁵ Thegan, *Gesta*, 26, ed. Tremp, pp. 214–15. On Judith, see Elizabeth Ward, "Caesar's Wife: The Career of the Empress Judith, 819–29," in *CH*, pp. 205–27.

⁸⁶ *Annales regni Francorum*, s.a. 777, ed. Pertz and Kurze, p. 49.

⁸⁷ *Annales regni Francorum*, s.a. 777, ed. Pertz and Kurze, p. 48–9.

produced by the emperor in 816.⁸⁸ The issues addressed in this document relate to the problems of proving that witnesses in a trial are false, the use of trial by combat or the ordeal of the cross, the legal status of Saxons and Frisians in comparison to Franks, and the problem of being sued or called before the court outside one's *patria*. The capitulary addresses the problem of making an oath about one's legal status and inheritance as follows:

If someone in another land, where he is accustomed to live either on account of a benefice or for some other reason, is called to court for whatever reason, let him make justice there according to his own law, and let him swear a legitimate oath with such fellow oath swearers of the sort he might have with him in that region or province. The exception to this is when someone shall summon him regarding his own status, that is regarding the freedom or inheritance which his dying father left him: regarding these two issues let him take the oath in his own homeland, that is in the legitimate place of the oath . . .⁸⁹

Here then is a passage of Carolingian—not specifically Saxon—legislation establishing that in cases about a person's free status or property in the empire they should take their oath in their *patria*, presumably so that they could do so with people of their same ethnicity. The Saxon bishops were most likely referring to this or other such legislation, when they raised the issue of the absence of Saxon witnesses at his oblation. For when they made their judgment, the bishops restored Gottschalk's "paternal freedom" (*libertas paterna*), which corresponds with the clause in the extract above referring to a person's freedom left by their dying father (*pater*). While Badurad and the other Saxon bishops rallied to Gottschalk's cause, presumably because they were Saxons, their method of defending his rights was with legislation applicable to all people living within the empire. For the Saxon bishops, protecting Gottschalk's rights as a nobleman was to defend him as a member of the Carolingian elite, and by extension to preserve their own status within that group as well.

Another issue of the hearing involving secular law was the bishops' attempt to settle the dispute with the paying of compensation and an oath. The compensation was quite likely for the violent manner (*violenter*) of Gottschalk's tonsuring, rather than simply for his loss of freedom in principle. As Paul Edward Dutton has argued, early medieval noblemen regarded their hair as symbolic of their freedom and status, making forced tonsuring very easily a disgrace to a nobleman of the highest

⁸⁸ *MGH Cap.* I, No. 134, pp. 267–9. On the developing tradition of Frankish law, see Alice Rio, *Legal Practice and the Written Word in the Early Middle Ages: Frankish Formulae, c.500–1000* (Cambridge, 2009); and Matthew Innes, "Charlemagne, Justice and Written Law," in *Law, Custom and Justice in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages: Proceedings of the 2008 Byzantine Colloquium*, ed. Alice Rio (London, 2011), pp. 155–203.

⁸⁹ *MGH Cap.* I, No. 134, 2, p. 268: "Si quis in aliena patria, ubi vel propter beneficium vel propter aliam quamlibet occasionem conversari solet, de qualibet causa fuerit interpellatus, ibi secundum suam legem iustitiam faciat, et cum talibus quales in ea regione vel provincia secum habere potuerit coniuratoribus legitimum sacramentum iuret. Excepto si quis eum de statu suo, id est de libertate sua vel de hereditate quam ei pater suus moriens dereliquit, appellaverit: de his duobus liceat illi sacramentum in patria, id est in legitimo sacramenti loco, iurandum offerre. . . ."

order.⁹⁰ Saxon law, like other early medieval law codes, was very specific regarding physical injuries, including those that might relate to a violent tonsuring. Simply to strike a nobleman required thirty *solidi* in compensation.⁹¹ But to cause a nobleman to bleed or to pull his hair each required one hundred and twenty, and if the injury caused bone to appear the fine was one hundred and eighty *solidi*.⁹² Should Gottschalk have resisted, his tonsuring could have been bloody and even resulted in more serious injury. In any case, the tonsuring would have involved the pulling of his hair, and as a Saxon nobleman, Gottschalk and his relatives could have demanded that Hrabanus pay the fine for the sake of honor. Yet while Saxon law would have dictated the amount to be paid, the *Lex Salica* allowed for Hrabanus, who was a Frank, to demand an oath from Gottschalk and his relatives to prove that *compensatio* should be paid.⁹³ Such an arrangement may also have been a way for the bishops to placate the furious abbot and save him the embarrassment of paying compensation.⁹⁴ Should he not demand the oath or Gottschalk fail to give it, then the matter of compensation would be pursued no further.

MEMORY OF THE SAXON WARS IN THE 820s AND 830s

In his *Liber*, Hrabanus attacked Gottschalk's argument with a historical critique of the Saxon *gens* as a conquered and forcibly converted people, suggesting that such a status denied them the right to avoid serving their Frankish masters. The abbot was not, however, the only writer of the late 820s and early 830s to interpret the significance of that conflict and the Saxon past for a contemporary audience. Charlemagne's favored courtier and biographer Einhard and the anonymous author of the *Translatio sancti Viti* also did so, although their interpretations were meant to contrast the Saxon past with the present in a positive way. Scholars have examined how Carolingian authors used the past to give meaning to the present and to influence their contemporaries, demonstrating the political importance of such strategies.⁹⁵ These three Carolingian authors' portrayals of the wars demonstrate

⁹⁰ Paul Dutton, "Charlemagne's Moustache," in id., *Charlemagne's Moustache and Other Cultural Clusters of a Dark Age* (New York, 2004), pp. 3–42, here 13–16 and 31–2.

⁹¹ *Lex Saxonum*, ed. von Schwerin, 1, p. 17: "De ictu nobilis XXX solidos, vel si negat tertia manu iuret."

⁹² *Lex Saxonum*, ed. von Schwerin, 3, 4, and 7, p. 18: "Si sanguinat CXX solidos vel eum XI iuret," "Si os paruerit, CLXXX solidos vel cum XI iuret," and "Si per capillos alium comprehenderit, CXX solidos componat vel undecima manu iuret."

⁹³ Schröbler, "Glossen," pp. 92–3 and Heinrich Brunner, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte* (Munich, 1928), II, p. 681.

⁹⁴ On bishops' role in settling disputes involving personal violence and compensation, see also Warren Brown, *Unjust Seizure: Conflict, Interest and Authority in an Early Medieval Society* (Ithaca, 2001), pp. 179–82.

⁹⁵ Examples of the growing literature on this theme include: Patrick Geary, *Phantoms of Remembrance: Memory and Oblivion at the End of the First Millennium* (Princeton, 1994); *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Yitzhak Hen and Matthew Innes (Cambridge, 2000); *The Construction of Communities in the Early Middle Ages: Texts, Resources and Artifacts*, ed. Richard

that the memory of the conflict and conversion was a topic loaded with political meaning that could be employed for very different ends decades after the integration of the Saxons into the Carolingian Empire was in full swing. In particular, Hrabanus' immediate concern with Gottschalk's case and the Saxon bishops at Mainz, which led him to create a very negative portrait of the Saxons, placed him quite out of step with the current political climate.

For the bishops, the issue of Gottschalk's trial was the infringement of his noble rights. Hrabanus, however, transformed the debate about Gottschalk's legal status into one over child oblation, disputing the appeal to secular law as a diversion from what he claimed was the real issue: Saxon opposition to monasticism. Hrabanus defended child oblation and monasticism as divinely inspired institutions traceable back to ancient Israel and the early church.⁹⁶ He turned chiefly to *lex divina*, or Scripture, and patristic authorities to refute Gottschalk's position and the bishops' decision as anti-monastic and therefore heretical.⁹⁷ But regarding the Saxon witnesses, he turned to recent history and approached the issue as follows:

For, they say, the law of their nation does not allow that a man can be summoned from another people [*gens*] to serve as a witness for the purpose of infringing their liberty. It is as if those who profess servitude to Christ uniquely destroy their liberty and nobility, since those (who are one with God) are more free than those who are proved by their different vices and sins to be slaves. They fashion their argumentation certainly only to make the monastic conversion and regular discipline hateful to men, saying that those who become monks are made into slaves; and those who say that one's vow of service is a duty of birth do not understand that they fight against the lord, for no power could be better or greater than to serve God, whom love serves well. . . . But let them consider what is sensible according to God and men: Should those who are inferior by virtue and dignity spurn those superior and more eminent than themselves, and reject them as if they were unworthy of all honor, those to whom they were rightly made subject? For who does not know, living in this region of the world, that the Franks were in the faith and religion of Christ before the Saxons, whom they later subjected to their dominion by force of arms—being made their superiors according to the practice of lords and even more by their paternal disposition—and dragging them away from the cult of idols and converting them to the faith of Christ? But now these notions are spurned ungratefully by certain primates of this very nation according to the flesh against the law of heaven and the law of the court: the witnesses are not deemed truthful and are cast aside unworthily, a decision that neither human and divine reason ever dictated nor that ever existed in the law of the three-cornered world . . .⁹⁸

Corradini, Max Diesenberger, and Helmut Reimitz (Leiden, 2003); McKitterick, *History and Memory*; ead., *Perceptions of the Past; The Resources of the Past in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. Clemens Gantner, Rosamond McKitterick, and Sven Meeder (Cambridge, 2015); and Reimitz, *History*, pp. 293–443.

⁹⁶ Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 419–32 (on oblation) and 433–40 (monasticism).

⁹⁷ de Jong, *Samuel's Image*, p. 84 and on Hrabanus and *lex divina* in general, see ead. "Old law and new-found power: Hrabanus Maurus and the Old Testament," in *Centres of Learning: Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East*, ed. Jan Willem Drijvers and Alasdair MacDonald (Leiden, 1995), pp. 161–76. On the wider place of ecclesiology in the law, see Innes, "Charlemagne," pp. 162–9.

⁹⁸ Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 431–2: "Hoc enim, aiunt, legem gentis suae pati non posse, ut alterius gentis homo in testimonium citetur ad infringendam legem libertatis suae. Quasi illi libertatem ac

Here Hrabanus expressed what is perhaps one of the most blatantly imperialist views of Frankish religion in favor of coercive methods of discipline, correction, and forced Christianization in the ninth century—a point previous scholarship has failed to emphasize. His intention was to build an argument to discredit Saxons as legitimate authorities in religious matters, and to do so he used antiquated views about the Saxons abandoned by his contemporaries for some time. Yet Hrabanus was insistent that this harsh view of the Saxons was entirely necessary, since they had not yet become proper Christians. His first critique was that the Saxon bishops were concerned with the damage to Gottschalk's freedom (*libertas*) and nobility (*nobilitas*) because he had been forced to become a slave (*servus*) as a monk. Arguing that they contrasted their nobility with monastic servitude, he suggested that the Saxons had not really learned how to be good Christians yet, since they rejected one of the most important spiritual institutions of the empire. They mistook monasticism for slavery, rather than as service to God, which Hrabanus saw as superior to any kind of earthly freedom. Hrabanus claimed also, earlier in the text, that his opponents were “worthy of death” for spreading such ideas among those under them, a comment disturbingly reminiscent of the capital punishment imposed on those Saxons who rebelled and abandoned Christianity during the wars—a fate that befell 4,500 Saxon rebels at Verden in 782.⁹⁹ Indeed, Hrabanus was arguing that Saxons were essentially the same as they had been during the wars: they were unwilling Christians still struggling against their Frankish masters.

Hrabanus' second critique was that the Saxon *gens* was inferior to the Frankish one, because the Franks had been Christian before the Saxons and had become their lords by right of conquest, dragging them away from their pagan idols. In this way, Hrabanus tried to convince his audience not only that as pagans the Saxons had been inferior to the Franks in the past, but also that they remained so because they came to Christianity late and then only by force. The Saxons were a conquered people, under the paternal thumb of their “superior” Frankish masters; therefore the bishops' desire for Saxon witnesses was illegitimate.¹⁰⁰ Consequently, it was not

nobilitatem generis sui perdant qui servitium Christi profitentur, cum magis illi liberi sint qui uni Deo, quam qui diversis vitiis atque peccatis, servire probantur. Hanc profecto non ob aliud argumentationem igitur fingunt, quam ut monasticam conversationem ac regularem disciplinam in odium hominibus vertant, dicentes eos servos fieri qui monachi fiunt; et non intelligunt se contra Dominum pugnare qui eius devotionem servitii dicunt pensum esse naturae, cum nulla sit melior maiorque potestas quam servire Deo, cui bene servit amor. . . . Haec vero cum se ita habeant, quae ratio est secundum Deum, aut secundum homines, ut qui inferiores sunt virtute et dignitate, superiores sibi et eminentiores spernant, et quasi indignos omni honore respuentes abjiciant, quibus subijci oportebat? Quis enim ignorat sub hac plaga mundi habitans, Francos ante Saxones in Christi fide atque religione fuisse, quos ipsi postmodum suae dominationi subegerunt armis, atque superiores effecti, dominorum ritu, imo magis paterno affectu, ab idolorum cultu abstrahentes, ad fidem Christi converterunt? Sed nunc a quibusdam primatibus de ipsa gente secundum carnem editis ingratis spernuntur, ac contra jus coeli contraque jus fori, ne testes esse veritatis valeant, indigne ajiciuntur cum hoc nec ratio humana, neque divina id fieri debere ullo modo dicet, nec talis ordo unquam in orbe triquadro fuerit. . . .”

⁹⁹ Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 431; *Annales regni Francorum*, s.a. 782, ed. Kurze, p. 62; and *MGH Cap. I*, No. 26, pp. 68–70, where the penalty for numerous crimes, including conspiring against the regime and abandoning one's faith, was execution.

¹⁰⁰ Patzold, “Konflikte,” pp. 150–3, notes that Agobard of Lyons employed a similar argument against the Burgundians when they desired to use the so-called *Lex Gundobadi* in 822.

fitting for Saxons to refuse to serve their Frankish masters. Hrabanus made a parallel argument about his own relationship to Gottschalk, claiming that *minores* should not contradict their *maiores*.¹⁰¹ This could provide an insight into the abbot's understanding of the Saxons, both as a whole and in the person of Gottschalk, whom Hrabanus regarded as spiritual juniors in need of paternal guidance that could take a brutal form.

Hrabanus' characterization of the Saxons could have been influenced by the Fulda text, *Vita sancti Sturmi*, written by Abbot Eigil probably 818–20, which, as Janneke Raaijmakers has argued, was important as a foundational history of Fulda.¹⁰² The text describes the Saxons as a depraved, perverse, cruel, and most aggressive *gens*, which was dedicated to pagan rites; had deviated from the faith of Christ; and had concerned itself with vain errors.¹⁰³ Nonetheless, the presence of Saxon monks at Fulda and the donations of Saxon counts to the monastery presumably made discussions about the Saxons and the memory of the wars a somewhat sensitive issue. Fulda's Saxon cartulary contains 115 entries from various Saxons and Frisians, including land donations from six different counts in addition to Gottschalk's father.¹⁰⁴ There was a great effort to foster the conversion of the Saxons in Fulda at this time, which meant that the abbot's (and his monks') attention was frequently turned toward Saxony.¹⁰⁵ The tensions and difficulties inherent in this mission may have affected life at Fulda, especially when a crisis such as the controversy surrounding Gottschalk's legal status erupted within the cloister's very walls.

Hrabanus also supported his vision of imperial Christianity by using historical examples from Roman and Persian history to argue that the inhabitants of these empires were united under a single imperial law: according to Hrabanus, different ethnic laws and the personality of the law were not allowed in other empires and therefore the Saxons in the Carolingian Empire should not have their own.¹⁰⁶ Here he was clearly misrepresenting Gottschalk's and the bishop's position, for it was Hrabanus—not his opponents—who emphasized a distinction between Saxon and other Carolingian elites. His argument failed to convince Louis the Pious at the

¹⁰¹ Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 425 and de Jong, *Samuel's Image*, p. 85.

¹⁰² Eigil, *Vita sancti Sturmi*, 23, in *Die Vita Sturmi des Eigil von Fulda: literarkritisch-historische Untersuchung und Edition*, ed. Pius Engelbert (Marburg, 1968), pp. 157–9. See also Engelbert, *Die Vita*, pp. 5–38 and Raaijmakers, *Making of the Monastic Community*, pp. 150–68 for a discussion of the text and its relationship to Fulda.

¹⁰³ Eigil, *Vita*, 23, ed. Engelbert, pp. 158–9.

¹⁰⁴ The names of the other counts are: Liutholf, Berenhart, Himmâs, Willehalm, Adalrih, and Erih. See, *Traditiones*, ed. Dronke, pp. 95–102.

¹⁰⁵ Hans Hummer, "The Identity of *Ludouicus piissimus Augustus* in the *Praefatio in librum antiquum lingua Saxonica conscriptum*," *Francia* 31 (2004), pp. 1–14; Dieter Geuenich, "Zur althochdeutschen Literature aus Fulda," in *Von der Klosterbibliothek zur Landesbibliothek: Beiträge zum zweihundertjährigen Bestehen der Hessische Landesbibliothek Fulda*, ed. Artur Brall (Stuttgart, 1978), pp. 99–124; Johannes Rathofer, "Altsächsische Literature," in *Kurzer Grundriß der germanischen Philologie bis 1500, vol. II: Literaturgeschichte*, ed. Ludwig Erich Schmitt (Berlin, 1971), pp. 247–61; and Ingeborg Schröbler, "Fulda und die althochdeutsche Literatur," in *Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch* 1 (1960), pp. 1–26. On the problem in general, see: Von Padberg, "Zum Sachsenbild," pp. 173–91.

¹⁰⁶ Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 432.

Assembly of Worms later in 829, where his archchaplain Hilduin also urged the elites of the empire to see themselves as one people rather than different *gentes*; the decision of Mainz was upheld.¹⁰⁷

In light of Hrabanus' severe interpretation of the memory of the Saxon wars, it is worth considering, for the sake of comparison, how other Carolingian authors from the 820s and 830s interpreted that past for their audiences. Writing his *Vita Karoli* sometime in the late 820s, Einhard narrated Charlemagne's efforts to conquer and convert the Saxons at length.¹⁰⁸ He wrote that by the conflict's end the Saxons, "having rejected the worship of demons and having abandoned their ancestors' rites, accepted the sacraments of the Christian faith and religion and became in effect joined to the Franks as one people."¹⁰⁹ While he contrasted the *perfidia Saxonum* during the fighting with Charlemagne's *magnanimitas* and *constantia mentis*, Einhard nevertheless emphasized that the Saxons willingly rejected paganism and adopted Christianity, becoming *one* with the Franks, rather than being dominated by them as Hrabanus wrote.¹¹⁰ Einhard also compared the losses of the Saxon *nobilitas* with those of the Frankish elite: "So many men from the nobility of both the Franks and the Saxons performed with the highest honors and were consumed in this war."¹¹¹ In doing so, he drew a parallel between the two elites that signified the unity to come after the fighting, offering a positive interpretation of the Saxon nobility for contemporaries, despite the great loss and destruction of the war. For Einhard, the war was history, or the past, while Saxon and Frankish unity was the present, which the court audience was meant to understand as a profound achievement of the regime.

Another text from the period is the anonymous *Historia translationis sancti Viti*, written at Corvey around 834, a monastery founded with Louis the Pious' support and approval.¹¹² This text was perhaps written by a Saxon author to commemorate the transfer of Saint Vitus' relics to Corvey in 822. The author presented a contrast similar to that of Einhard between the memory of the forced Saxon conversion and the current identity of their nobles. While Charlemagne compelled the Saxons to be a part of the empire and had defeated them when they rebelled, they now

¹⁰⁷ *Epistolarum Fuldensium fragmenta*, MGH Epp. V, pp. 519–20. On Worms, see de Jong, *Samuel's Image*, p. 83 and Freise, "Studien," p. 1023.

¹⁰⁸ Einhard, *Vita Karoli*, ed. Georg Waitz, MGH SSRG 25 (Hanover, 1911). On dating the *Vita Karoli*, see Matthias Tischler, *Einhard's Vita Karoli. Studien zur Entstehung, Überlieferung und Rezeption*, 2 vols. (Hanover, 2001), I, pp. 151–239; and Reimitz, *History*, pp. 421–2. For an earlier view on the dating, see McKitterick, *History and Memory*, pp. 29–30.

¹⁰⁹ Einhard, *Vita Karoli*, 7, ed. Pertz, p. 10: "abiecto daemonum cultu atque relictis patriis caerimoniis, Christianiae fidei atque religionis sacramenta susciperent et Francis adunati unus cum eis populus efficerentur."

¹¹⁰ Einhard, *Vita Karoli*, 7, ed. Pertz, p. 10; and see Beumann, "Hagiographie," 137–8. Also on the question of *perfidia*, see Robert Flierman, "Gens perfida or populus Christianus? Saxon (In)Fidelity in Frankish Historical Writing," in *The Resources of the Past in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. Clemens Gantner, Rosamond McKitterick, and Sven Meeder (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 188–205.

¹¹¹ Einhard, *Vita Karoli*, 8, ed. Pertz, p. 11: "Plures tamen eo bello tam ex nobilitate Francorum quam Saxonum et functi summis honoribus viri consumpti sunt."

¹¹² *Historia translationis sancti Viti*, 4, ed. Georg Pertz, MGH SS II (Hanover, 1829), pp. 576–85, here 577–8. On this text, see Appleby, "Spiritual Progress," pp. 603–7, and Röckelein, *Reliquien-translationen*, pp. 100–8.

submitted with a devout mind.¹¹³ The author also noted that the number of monks at Corvey at the time of the *historia* was constantly growing from additions from the “most noble race of the Saxons,” and when the relics arrived, other Saxon nobles prayed alongside the monks for the favor of Saint Vitus at the monastery.¹¹⁴ Like Einhard before him, the author of the *Historia* understood the conquest, rebellion, and conversion of the Saxons as a remote thing of the past; to him Saxon nobles, like other Carolingian elites, became monks or prayed alongside them.¹¹⁵ As in the case of the *Vita Karoli*, the *Historia* presented a picture of unity and equality between the Frankish and Saxon world in the present, whereas Hrabanus’ *Liber* offered one of disunity and inequality with the Saxons. Hrabanus’ picture was essentially the same as that during the wars: the Saxons were bad, reluctant Christians, and an inferior, conquered people vastly different from the noble, Christian Franks.

THE HÉLIAND AND THE SAXON NOBILITY

But one might still ask how Saxon nobles, and particularly clerics, viewed themselves as Carolingian elites in the 820s and 830s, especially regarding the issues of *servitium* and *libertas*, which Gottschalk emphasized and Hrabanus raised in his *Liber*. A text that will provide some answers to this question is the *Héliand*, an Old Saxon translation of the Gospels, written by a famous, albeit unnamed, Saxon poet sometime during the same period as the *Vita Karoli*, the *Historia*, and Hrabanus’ *Liber*.¹¹⁶ Louis sought to bolster the loyalty of his Saxon nobles through sponsoring or at least supporting the translation of the Bible into Old Saxon, which survives today in the form of the Old Saxon Genesis fragment and the *Héliand*.¹¹⁷ The principal evidence for dating the translation to Louis’ reign is the *praefatio*, which notes how the emperor supported the translation out of a desire to help his subjects speaking the *theudisca lingua* better to understand their faith.¹¹⁸ While there has been some debate about whether the translation was made under Louis the Pious or Louis the German, the description of Louis as “Ludouicus piissimus Augustus” in the preface is consistent with the former’s title during his reign.¹¹⁹ German

¹¹³ *Historia translationis sancti Viti*, 7, ed. Pertz, p. 577.

¹¹⁴ *Historia translationis sancti Viti*, 8 and 16, ed. Pertz, pp. 578–9 and 581–2.

¹¹⁵ von Padberg, “Zum Sachsenbild,” pp. 183–7, describes the changing image of the Saxons as a whole in hagiographical texts from later in the ninth century in similar terms.

¹¹⁶ *Héliand und Genesis*, ed. Hermann Paul and Otto Behaghel, 10th ed. (Tübingen, 1996). The English translation is *The Héliand: The Saxon Gospel*, tr. Ronald Murphy (Oxford, 1992).

¹¹⁷ Good introductions to the poem include Wolfgang Haubrichs, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn der Neuzeit: Die Anfänge: Versuche volkssprachiger Schriftlichkeit im frühen Mittelalter (ca. 700–1050/60)*, ed. Joachim Heinze (Frankfurt am Main, 1988), pp. 330–53 and John Knight Bostock, *A Handbook on Old High German Literature*, rev. ed. (Oxford, 1976), pp. 169–77.

¹¹⁸ *Héliand*, ed. Paul and Behaghel, pp. 1–2.

¹¹⁹ *Héliand*, ed. Paul and Behaghel, pp. 1–2; Hummer, “Identity,” pp. 1–14, and Hans Hummer, *Politics and Power in Early Medieval Europe* (Cambridge, 2005), pp. 137–43. For an alternative position, see Wolfgang Haubrichs, “Die Praefatio des Héliand: Ein Zeugnis der Religions- und

nationalist scholarship in the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth century saw the text as evidence for the "Germanization of Christianity," while more recent studies have viewed the text as evidence of Carolingian attempts to spread Christianity among the Saxons or to impose it on them.¹²⁰ While the preface indicates the text's Christianizing purpose, Haubrichs suggests foremost that the work was meant to make the Gospel speak to its very particular Saxon audience.¹²¹ In this sense, the *Héliand* could be said to represent Gottschalk's views as well as those of the Saxon bishops on what it meant to serve Christ as nobles in the empire.

The author's name is unknown, but the poem's preface indicates that he was a well-known Saxon poet, although it does not specify whether he was an Anglo-Saxon or a Saxon.¹²² The text was written either in or near Saxony. Fulda, Werden, and Corvey have been suggested as the place of origin, although there is no way to be sure which is correct.¹²³ Since so many other Old High German texts originated in Fulda under Hrabanus' leadership, including the translation of Tatian's *Diatesseron* (which formed the basis for the *Héliand* translation), the case for Fulda is a strong one.¹²⁴ Gottschalk has even been suggested as the poem's author, although there is little evidence to support this.¹²⁵ The fact that the *praefatio* claims that the author was already a famous Saxon poet suggests that Gottschalk, who seems to have written only Latin poetry and that not until after his time at Fulda, was not the composer.¹²⁶ Haubrichs suggests instead that the poet was a figure like Cædmon,

Bildungspolitik Ludwigs des Deutschen," in *Niederdeutsches Jahrbuch* 89 (1966), pp. 7–32; and Goldberg, *Struggle for Empire*, pp. 183–4.

¹²⁰ Haubrichs, *Anfänge* 330–4; Hermann Dörries, "Der Héliand als Missionspredigt," in id., *Wort und Stunde* (Göttingen, 1969), II, pp. 259–76, and John Hines, "The Conversion of the Old Saxons," in *The Continental Saxons from the Migration Period to the Tenth Century*, ed. David Green and Frank Siegmund (Rochester: NY, 2003), pp. 299–314, who argues that the text was imposed on the Saxons by their conquerors. For examples of older scholarship dealing with "Germanization," see Walter Baetke, *Die Aufnahme des Christentums durch die Germanen. Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Germanisierung des Christentums*, in *Vom Geist und Erbe Thules* (Göttingen, 1944), pp. 82–117; Hermann Wicke, "Der Dichter des Héliand als germanischer Verkündiger des Wortes Gottes," in *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte* 43 (1938), pp. 32–48; and Ludwig Wolff, "Germanisches Frühchristentum im Héliand," in *Zeitschrift für Deutschkunde* 49 (1935), pp. 37–54. The concept of the "Germanization" of Christianity comes from August Friederich Christian Vilmar, *Deutsche Altertümer im Héliand als Einkleidung der evangelischen Geschichte* (Marburg, 1845). Ronald Murphy, *The Saxon Savior: The Germanic Transformation of the Gospel in the Ninth-Century Héliand* (Oxford, 1989), revives his thesis, although he views the poem as a union of Germanic and Christian cultures.

¹²¹ Haubrichs, *Anfänge*, p. 346. See also McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 196–7.

¹²² *Héliand*, ed. Paul and Behaghel, pp. 1–2.

¹²³ Hummer, *Politics and Power*, pp. 138–40 discusses the arguments.

¹²⁴ Geuenisch, "Literature aus Fulda," pp. 99–124; Rathofer, "Altsächsische Literatur," pp. 247–61 and Schröbler, "Fulda," pp. 1–26.

¹²⁵ Tette Hofstra, "A Note on the 'Darkness of the Night' Motif in Alliterative Poetry, and the Search for the Poet of the Old Saxon Héliand," in *Loyal Letters: Studies on Mediaeval Alliterative Poetry and Prose*, ed. Luuk Houwen and Alasdair MacDonald (Groningen, 1994), pp. 93–104, here 96–7 and Heinz Rupp, "Forschung zur althochdeutschen Literatur 1945–1962," *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 38 (1964), pp. 1–67, here 50. On Gottschalk learning verse after his time at Fulda, see his poem *Age quæso perge Clio* to Ratramnus, written 849, in *Gedichte*, ed. Weber, pp. 156 (lines 86–7) and 254–7.

¹²⁶ *Héliand*, ed. Paul and Behaghel, pp. 1–2.

described by Bede as having simply heard the biblical stories and then composed Old English poetry about them by divine inspiration rather than by training in meter and prosody.¹²⁷ Nonetheless, Gottschalk could easily have been familiar with the *Héliand*, whether it was produced at Fulda or elsewhere, and would have been able to make his argument resonate with the text's discussions of *libertas* and *servitium*.

The preface indicates that the poet wrote in the Saxon idiom so that the audience—*litterati et illiterati*—could better understand the story.¹²⁸ Such an approach seems to have been directed at Saxon nobles in particular. All of the participants in the story, including Christ and his family, are characterized as noble by birth.¹²⁹ Particular scenes, such as the Wedding at Cana, depicted as a large feast in a great hall with the noble participants happily getting drunk on apple wine (*lið*), seem to reflect what a noble Saxon listener would find appropriate.¹³⁰ Christ commands his apostles to seek out the nobles of each town when they spread the Gospel.¹³¹ The savior himself is portrayed as a lord (*drohtin*) whose disciples are noble-born (*aðalborana*) warrior-companions (*gisīðas*) or thanes (*thegan*).¹³² The themes of their loyalty to their lord and courage in exchange for the gift of eternal life are striking examples of how the Saxon elites may have viewed relationships of lords and followers as simultaneously political and spiritual.¹³³ The fact that the Saxon elites' relationship with the Carolingian regime involved their acceptance of Christianity suggests that they may have understood their connection with Charlemagne and Louis the Pious in just such terms. The image of Christ even changes slightly over the course of the poem: Christ the generous giver of jewels becomes Christ the leader guiding his warrior companions to "God's light" of eternal salvation¹³⁴—a transformation meant to emphasize the ultimate importance of the spiritual aspect of following one's ruler.

The *Héliand* poet treated the themes of service and loss of freedom very specifically. In the poem, a thane's freely given service to his lord (*theganskepi*)—here given to Christ in exchange for eternal life—is juxtaposed with the service sinners must render the devils in Hel as punishment.¹³⁵ Saxon nobles probably viewed voluntary service as appropriate to their status as Carolingian elites, while coerced service was beneath them or suitable as a punishment for those who broke their oaths to their lord. Such an attitude may explain why the Saxon bishops, and

¹²⁷ Haubrichs, *Anfänge*, p. 333.

¹²⁸ *Héliand*, ed. Paul and Behaghel, pp. 1–2.

¹²⁹ See, for example, *Héliand*, ed. Paul and Behaghel, pp. 16–17 and 49–50. For the translation, see: *The Héliand*, trans. Murphy, pp. 12–13 and 43. See also Haubrichs, *Anfänge*, pp. 336 and 343–5.

¹³⁰ *Héliand*, ed. Paul and Behaghel, pp. 76–9; and *The Héliand*, trans. Murphy, pp. 67–9.

¹³¹ *Héliand*, ed. Paul and Behaghel, p. 74; and *The Héliand*, trans. Murphy, p. 65.

¹³² *Héliand*, ed. Paul and Behaghel, pp. 46–9, 49–51, 82, and 143; and *The Héliand*, trans. Murphy, pp. 40–2, 42–4, 72, and 130–1.

¹³³ *Héliand*, ed. Paul and Behaghel, pp. 143 and 166–7; and *The Héliand*, trans. Murphy, pp. 130–1 and 154–5.

¹³⁴ *Héliand*, ed. Paul and Behaghel, pp. 48 and 103–4; and *The Héliand*, trans. Murphy, pp. 42 and 91–2.

¹³⁵ *Héliand*, ed. Paul and Behaghel, pp. 156–9 and 163; and *The Héliand*, trans. Murphy, pp. 143–6 and 150.

any of Gottschalk's relatives at the synod, reacted so strongly to his coerced monastic *servitium*, and sought to rescue him from this state. Christ's loss of freedom was dramatically described in the *Héliand* as well. The poet portrayed him fifteen times in bonds (*bendi*) and iron chains (*fiterios*) from the time he was taken by the thanes of the high priests until his crucifixion.¹³⁶ This image may have symbolized to the audience the great disgrace of losing one's freedom and may have conjured up memories of the wars in the minds of Saxons; the poet emphasized this point by representing Christ as afraid of his enemies' iron chains before his battle-like encounter with them on Gethsemane.¹³⁷

The similarity between this image and Gottschalk's loss of *libertas* is conspicuous. The synod pronounced Gottschalk freed from his chain (*vinculum*) when he recovered his freedom.¹³⁸ This can be read figuratively, in the sense that the monastic vow bound one to a life of service to God, and literally, if Hrabanus brought him to Mainz bound as a troublesome prisoner. Whatever the case, our analysis indicates that they viewed Gottschalk's monastic status as unlawful bondage and a form of *servitium* to which he had been wrongfully subjected.

HRABANUS, THE *LIBER DE OBLATIONE* *PUERORUM*, AND FULDA

In his *Liber*, Hrabanus sought to subvert these arguments, and correspondingly the outcome of the hearing at Mainz, by reconceptualizing them as heresy.¹³⁹ Hrabanus hoped to convince Louis the Pious and those gathered at Worms not long thereafter to reconsider the decision and to see Gottschalk and his allies as a heretical threat to Carolingian monasticism in need of correction. While Hrabanus failed, he may have been more successful on his home ground of Fulda. For Hrabanus' *Liber* would also have been an extremely effective device for reestablishing his authority and restoring order at Fulda after his defeat at the Synod of Mainz. His handling of Gottschalk may have resulted in ill will for a short while among brothers who supported Gottschalk or disapproved of their abbot's approach as being too reminiscent of Ratgar's. Hrabanus indicated that Gottschalk argued the monastic life was not necessary for salvation, which might have created an uproar within the monastic community itself.¹⁴⁰ It is possible that other *fratres*, who had also been forced into the monastic life, considered following Gottschalk's path. If this were true, then one can imagine that Hrabanus sought to restore his authority in the abbey quickly and with a firm hand by defaming Gottschalk and refuting the

¹³⁶ *Héliand*, ed. Paul and Behaghel, pp. 174, 175, 176, 178, 181, 183–4, 185–7, 188–9, 191, and 193; and *The Héliand*, trans. Murphy, pp. 162, 164, 166–7, 168–9, 171–2, 173–4, 176, 179, and 181. Murphy suggests a connection between the portrayal of Christ and Saxon memories of bondage during Charlemagne's reign.

¹³⁷ *Héliand*, ed. Paul and Behaghel, p. 170, and *The Héliand*, trans. Murphy 158.

¹³⁸ *MGH Conc.* II, No. 50 [Mainz, 829], p. 604.

¹³⁹ Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 421 and 436–7.

¹⁴⁰ Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 430 and 434–5.

arguments accepted by the synod as heretical. By emphasizing Gottschalk's path as the way of error, Hrabanus let his monks know they would be in for swift and relentless correction should they show signs of disobedience.

To this end Hrabanus transformed Gottschalk's legal case into a doctrinal one, employing biblical and patristic authorities against his opponents' canon and secular law.¹⁴¹ He argued that his adversaries were contradicting *lex divina* and, therefore, divine authority.¹⁴² By deflecting his readers' eyes away from the legal debate, Hrabanus was able to transform child oblation into a divinely inspired institution on which monasticism depended for its survival and which was under attack by his heretical opponents. Hrabanus assembled a large collection of biblical citations as well as some patristic ones, including Gregory the Great's *Dialogues* and Jerome's *Contra Vigilantium*, in order to substantiate his accusations.¹⁴³ The *Liber* allows a rare opportunity to observe how a Carolingian intellectual fashioned his opponents' views into a heresy, an approach, as noted before, Hrabanus would again use later with Gottschalk in the 840s.

Hrabanus put together several arguments to prove Gottschalk was a heretic. Drawing from Isidore's *Sententiae*, Hrabanus wrote that Gottschalk claimed not to be against monasticism, but only against child oblation, and in this way he was like the heretics and schismatics, because they never rejected the whole Christian religion, only a part of it, mixing falsehoods with truths.¹⁴⁴ Hrabanus also wrote that to disparage a part (*species*) was to mock the whole (*genus*). New Testament authors helped him shape his argument, including: (Mt 5, 19) "He who leaves out one of the least of these mandates, and teaches men so, will be called the least in the kingdom of heaven," which comes from the Sermon on the Mount; (Jac 2, 10) "He who offends in one thing, is made answerable for all"; and other similar quotations.¹⁴⁵ Hrabanus claimed that to blaspheme child oblation led to excommunication and Hell, and the only way to save oneself was through penitence worthy of one's error. He condemned Gottschalk's "doctrines" as new and wicked, arguing that instead of the backing of biblical and patristic authorities they were influenced by deceiving spirits of error with demonic teachings.¹⁴⁶

Hrabanus also emphasized that Gottschalk and his supporters were heretics because as unjust usurpers of his abbatial authority they constituted a threat to others, in particular to Fulda's monks. The intention here was, of course, to recast Gottschalk's legal actions in a new light on the doctrinal stage, and here we can see how the abbot's concern for his position in the monastery was foremost on his mind. Hrabanus compared his enemies to pseudo-authorities such as the Pharisees

¹⁴¹ Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 423 and 432. Clearly Hrabanus saw biblical authority as the greatest of all. See: de Jong, "Old law," pp. 161–76, and Patzold, "Konflikte im Kloster," pp. 147–8.

¹⁴² Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 433.

¹⁴³ Gregory the Great, *Der heilige Benedikt. Buch II der Dialoge, lateinisch/deutsch*, ed. Salzburger Äbtekonzferenz (St. Ottilien, 1995), and Jerome, *Contra Vigilantium*, ed. J.-L. Feiertag, CCSL 79C (Turnhout, 2005), pp. 5–30.

¹⁴⁴ Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 420–1; and Isidore, *Sententiae*, III, 12, 6, ed. Pierre Cazier, CCSL 111 (Turnhout, 1998), p. 235.

¹⁴⁵ Hrabanus also refers to the following Biblical passages: I Cor 5, 6; I Jo 2, 19; II Jo 1, 9; and Jo 3, 13.

¹⁴⁶ Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 419–20 and 430.

and legal experts described in Luke's Gospel and the sons of malediction described in Peter's Second Epistle. Of special concern, according to Hrabanus, was that Gottschalk was spreading his ideas and influencing others against monasticism, for which he and his supporters were worthy of death.¹⁴⁷ The abbot drew from parts of the Letter of Jude to compare his enemies to infamous biblical villains: Cain, Balaam, and Corah.¹⁴⁸ In this case, however, Hrabanus was actually quoting Bede's commentary on the letter without indicating it.¹⁴⁹ He wrote that the heretics—meaning his enemies—were like Cain since they assumed (out of jealousy toward their betters) the name of *docti* and slew their *fratres* with the sword of wicked doctrine; they were like Corah (who was swallowed up by the earth in the wilderness for challenging Aaron's authority) because they separated themselves from the church out of a desire for undue primacy and they knowingly committed evil; and they were like Balaam (who was slain by the Israelites for counseling them to trespass against God) since they assailed the truth, deceived others with wicked counsel, and loved earthly reward.¹⁵⁰

In this case, Hrabanus simply adapted Bede's comparison of heretics with these biblical figures as a series of types with which to characterize Gottschalk and his supporters, allowing the biblical examples to make their impact on his audience. Hrabanus' concern for his authority over the *fratres* at Fulda must have led him to draw from Bede's text, who had been concerned especially with monks (*fratres*) in his commentary, unlike the author of Jude. At the center of Bede's argument was a concern for his authority, and the fact that heretics rejected being corrected (*emendari*).¹⁵¹ Should any Fulda brothers refuse to obey him, Hrabanus wanted them to know that their disobedience was tantamount to heresy, and that anyone guilty of such evil was worthy of death—much like the Saxon rebels had been during the wars so many decades before.

Hrabanus used biblical examples to show that oblation and monasticism were favored by God and therefore divine institutions. His strategy here was to convince his audience that child oblations in Carolingian monasteries were essentially the same as biblical oblations and offerings, which God had favored, and his text amounts to an exegetical commentary on scriptural offerings.¹⁵² His examples included: Cain and Abel, Abraham and Isaac, the Levites, the firstborn in Egypt, Jephthe from the Book of Judges (who sacrificed his only daughter to God), Hannah

¹⁴⁷ Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 430–1 and 432.

¹⁴⁸ Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 425. The biblical passages are: Jd 4 and 11–14. Balaam, however, was a complex figure for early medieval thinkers even at Fulda. See Coon, *Dark Age Bodies*, p. 58 for another perspective in Fulda's tradition.

¹⁴⁹ Bede, *In epistulas septem catholicas*, VII, 11, ed. David Hurst, CCSL 121 (Turnhout, 1983), p. 338. The quotation is nearly verbatim.

¹⁵⁰ Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 425.

¹⁵¹ On Bede and heresy, see: Paul Hayward, "Before the Coming of Popular Heresy: The Rhetoric of Heresy in English Historiography, c.700–1154," in *Heresy in Transition: Transforming Ideas of Heresy in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. John Christian Laursen, Ian Hunter, and Cary Nederman (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 9–27, here 9–14.

¹⁵² Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 428.

and Samuel, and Christ's "oblation" at the temple.¹⁵³ Hrabanus used extended quotations to prove his point, again allowing the biblical examples to give great weight to his argument. Having established the scriptural basis of child oblation, he then drew from Gregory the Great's *Dialogues* to show how Gregory, Benedict of Nursia, and "noble and pious" (*nobiles et religiosi*) Romans, who brought their young sons to Benedict, had favored it as well.¹⁵⁴

At the end of his work, Hrabanus claimed that Gottschalk and his supporters should stop criticizing and slandering monasticism, which they clearly misunderstood.¹⁵⁵ He argued that the New Testament and patristic writings proved monasticism was a divinely inspired institution.¹⁵⁶ Christ himself favored it, since he approved of the kinds of work that monks did, and Jerome—a renowned patristic supporter of monasticism—defended it in his *Contra Vigilantium*.¹⁵⁷ Then Hrabanus changed tactics a bit to show his paternal and nurturing side, arguing that anyone supporting Gottschalk must be insane and in need of the help of a fatherly abbot, since to be against monasticism was to be against Christ. Yet even more important, Hrabanus offered clear consolation to anyone tempted to follow Gottschalk down the path of error: while disobedience to the abbot was tantamount to disobeying Christ and therefore heretical and punishable by damnation, obedience and the acceptance of the abbot's correction restored one to Fulda's holy community.

CONCLUSION

Behind the remarkable story of Gottschalk's escape from the cloister and his abbot's control lie the complex legacies of Saxon Christianization, the history of Fulda, and monastic reform in the 810s. Each of these features of late eighth and early ninth century history shows the tensions between coercive forces in Frankish imperial religion and those groups and individuals within the empire who sought to limit them or at least to prevent themselves and their allies from falling victim to them. In the case of Fulda, a tradition of conflict over forced tonsuring and the rough handling of young monks among other things created an atmosphere in which Gottschalk found the initial, critical support against his abbot, support that opened the door to his hearing at the Synod of Mainz. Also, both the Fulda monks and the bishops at the synod knew of the monastic reforms of the 810s meant to regularize and prevent abuses in the processes of oblation and monastic conversion. Additionally, the historical transformation of Saxon elites into imperial nobles through loyalty to and cooperation with the regime led to very particular views among well-born Saxons about a nobleman's freely given, honorable service—an idea that

¹⁵³ Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 421–9. See also: de Jong, *In Samuel's Image*, pp. 84–5.

¹⁵⁴ Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 433. See also Gregory the Great, *Der hl. Benedikt*, 3, 13–14, pp. 120–2.

¹⁵⁵ Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 436–7.

¹⁵⁶ Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 435–8.

¹⁵⁷ Hrabanus, *Liber*, PL 107: 438–9. See also Jerome, *Contra Vigilantium*, ed. Feiertag, pp. 5–30.

formed the basis of the arguments used by Gottschalk and on his behalf at the synod to restore his freedom. The coercive element in Gottschalk's case made Hrabanus appear to be out of step with the bishops' reform agenda in 829. That said, the abbot's *Liber* shows how easily the Frankish tradition of domination and forceful correction remained readily available when those in positions of authority required an argument supporting severe measures. As will be seen in Chapter 2, Gottschalk would soon find himself subject to such correction again not long after his departure from Fulda.

Gottschalk's escape from his abbot's control in 829 forms the wholly unusual beginning to the career he would pursue away from Fulda for the rest of his life. The events at Mainz reveal how Gottschalk was able to escape the carefully maintained system of cultivating, controlling, and culling young monks as potential intellectuals and high-ranking clerics by established and respected patrons, such as Hrabanus. This was a remarkable success that must have made a great impression on the young Gottschalk. When faced with the prospect of being excluded from this very select group of elite monks by his abbot, he broke with Hrabanus in an unprecedented way. Though Gottschalk would seek the support of patrons elsewhere in traditional ways and would attempt to cultivate students of his own in the future, this event placed him on a very unusual and singular path in the ninth century—something which should be borne in mind while following the developments of his career and thought. Gottschalk would continue to demonstrate an inclination to gravitate toward conflict with ecclesiastical superiors opposing him, a process he understood as his unjust persecution at the hands of illegitimate religious authorities. In this way, Gottschalk's early experiences with Hrabanus, his interactions with the bishops at the Synod of Mainz, the outcome of his hearing, and Hrabanus' attempts to discredit him as a heretic provided a unique framework for a career marked by various kinds of controversy, creative and learned methods of argumentation, a great confidence in the face of opposition that was easily interpreted as disrespectful obstinacy, and an unflinching sense of the righteousness of his cause whatever the circumstances.

2

Betrayal and Injustice in the Early 830s

Following the Synod of Mainz in 829, Gottschalk's newly-restored freedom and episcopal connections placed him well for pursuing a clerical career in the early 830s. To that end, he soon won the patronage of the influential Archbishop Ebbo of Rheims and studied at the monastery of Corbie, one of Francia's leading intellectual centers famed for its missionary training. Winning Ebbo's favor was no small achievement, since he was one of the leading ecclesiastical figures of the empire and one of Louis the Pious' most trusted advisors.¹ Based on his later experiences, Gottschalk quite likely intended to become a missionary himself, perhaps hoping to work in the Baltic region like other monks from Corbie and his patron Archbishop Ebbo. Gottschalk may have even anticipated that serving the archbishop might one day win him a bishopric or an abbacy in one of the many monasteries around Rheims.

Yet Gottschalk's plans soon went awry, for the early 830s were an ill-fated time for the beginning of his career. The reform councils of 829 proved unable to restore unity and confidence in Louis the Pious' regime, and the realm erupted the following year in the so-called Loyal Rebellion. In 830 when Gottschalk was at Corbie, the monastery became a wellspring of revolt centered around Abbot Wala, leading to the rebellion, in which Louis' sons (save Louis the German) and many of his trusted allies attempted to end the dominance of the emperor's controversial advisor, Bernard of Septimania, and Empress Judith at court, and in the process deposed Louis, albeit only temporarily.² Wala, the Abbot of Corbie and Charlemagne's cousin, was a leader of this failed revolt, and Gottschalk quickly found himself condemned for treason along with Corbie's abbot and he was forcibly tonsured once again on orders of his recently-won patron, Archbishop Ebbo.

Such a reversal proved the occasion for Gottschalk to compose his earliest surviving writings, which include: a letter written in rhythmic prose to Archbishop

¹ Hans Goetting, *Das Bistum Hildesheim 3: Die Hildesheimer Bischöfe von 815 bis 1221 (1227)* (Berlin, 1984), pp. 56–84; Depreux, *Prosopographie*, pp. 169–74; Peter McKeon, "Archbishop Ebbo of Reims (816–835): A Study of the Carolingian Empire and Church," *Church History* 43 (1974), pp. 437–47; and Stuart Airlie, "Bonds of Power and Bonds of Association in the Court Circle of Louis the Pious," in *CH*, pp. 191–204, here 191 and 200–4. The principal narrative source for his reign is Flodoard of Reims, *Historia Remensis ecclesiae*, II, 19–20, ed. Martina Stratmann, *MGH SS* 36 (Hanover, 1998), pp. 175–89, on which see Sot, *Flodoard*, pp. 471–85.

² de Jong, *Penitential State*, pp. 205–13; Boshof, *Ludwig*, pp. 182–91; Roger Collins, "Pippin I and the Kingdom of Aquitaine," in *CH*, pp. 363–89, here 380–4; and Karl Brunner, *Oppositionelle Gruppen im Karolingerreich* (Vienna, 1979), pp. 109–19 discusses some of the relationships between the rebels.

Ebbo in 831, his *Domino clementissimo*;³ the introductory verse to the Ebbo Gospels;⁴ and the hymns *Christe mearum* and *Spes mea Christe*.⁵ This chapter offers the first analysis of these works (along with their literary resonances) as a related body of Gottschalk's writing from the early 830s. What links these texts is Gottschalk's development of a very particular language of religious attachment to Christ as his client (*cliens Christi*), a way of self-identification that was at least in part meant to help him restore his patron–client relationship with Archbishop Ebbo. This issue was especially significant, since Gottschalk was accused of leading a conspiracy against Ebbo as part of his alleged participation in the rebellion. The longest and most important of these works is Gottschalk's verse letter, which includes not only a relatively straightforward appeal to the archbishop, in which he protested his innocence and sought the archbishop's aid, but also an embedded and much more confrontational message—an accusation that the Ebbo had wrongfully and unjustly condemned his client.

Uncovering this hidden message will require deep, but playful reading of Gottschalk's letter and its literary resonances. Indeed, its carefully-crafted message sent knowing readers, who shared with Gottschalk a common experience of studying scripture and exegesis, on a winding course through textual allusions to other, familiar literary authorities. At the end of this intertextual path of thought was Gottschalk's accusation against his former patron. Gottschalk's appeal and warning to Ebbo fits in the 820s tradition of *admonitio*, by which followers could claim to warn their patrons and lords about their errors and moral failings as part of their loyal service.⁶ Following the literary allusions will show how Ebbo was to understand that he, rather than Gottschalk, was the real traitor, and Christ—their mutual heavenly lord and patron—would exact vengeance on the archbishop for so terrible a crime, unless he repented and lifted Gottschalk's sentence.

Gottschalk's writings here constitute his earliest extant articulation of himself as God's suffering and innocent servant being persecuted by unjust religious authorities, a way of self-conceptualization that probably had its roots in his experiences with Hrabanus Maurus in the 820s, but that now took on more definite shape. It is possible that Gottschalk's success against Hrabanus at Mainz made him seem a likely traitor, since he had *already* turned on a patron. Yet his experiences with Ebbo also speak to the imperial elites' wider concerns about whether to place their loyalty with Emperor Louis or his sons in the early 830s. At that time, the emperor repeatedly altered his sons' status and particular royal holdings as "sub-kings," forcing their followers as a result to swear conflicting oaths of loyalty, which endangered their immortal souls and threatened to bring down divine wrath on the realm; the stresses over these issues came to a head in 833 when an even larger rebellion, in which Archbishop Ebbo played an important role, deposed Emperor

³ Lambot, "Lettre inédite," pp. 40–51. For earlier examinations of Gottschalk's life in the 830s, see Traube, *PLAC* III, pp. 709–11; and Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 16–18.

⁴ Gottschalk, *Ebbo Remense decus*, *PLAC* I, pp. 623–4, and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 186–7.

⁵ Gottschalk, *Christe, mearum* and *Spes mea Christe*, *PLAC* III, pp. 724–6; and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 135–9.

⁶ de Jong, *Penitential State*, pp. 112–42.

Louis again.⁷ Yet by 834 Louis recovered power and among the few singled out for punishment in the rebellion was Archbishop Ebbo, making it unlikely that his patronage could help further Gottschalk's ambitions.

GOTTSCHALK AND EBBO OF RHEIMS

A core piece of evidence for establishing Gottschalk's activities in the early 830s is his verse letter to Ebbo. Lambot argued convincingly that Gottschalk was the text's author and Ebbo its recipient, and Bernhard Bischoff agreed with his assessment.⁸ The letter matches the distinctive style of Gottschalk's other writings and the text survived in an early or mid ninth century portion of a Rheims manuscript.⁹ Since the text was written during the joint reign of two emperors, Louis the Pious and Lothar, it can be placed during the episcopate of Ebbo, before the archbishop's leading role in Louis the Pious' public penance and dethronement in 833.¹⁰ Before discussing the contents of the letter itself, however, we must reconstruct Gottschalk's movements after the Synod of Mainz—in particular his acquaintance with Ebbo—up to the point of the letter's composition.

Gottschalk could have made a connection to Ebbo at the Assembly of Worms in August 829, where all of the bishops from the four great assemblies of that year (Paris, Mainz, Lyons, and Toulouse) met to inform the emperor about their respective outcomes.¹¹ Gottschalk's episcopal supporters from Mainz could have put him in contact with Ebbo there, since Ebbo had been one of the organizers of the Paris assembly and would have been present to relate its proceedings. There is even evidence that Ebbo could have previously met Gottschalk. For in 826 Ebbo's name was placed in the *Verbrüderungsbuch* of Reichenau, when Gottschalk was also present at the monastery.¹² Had Ebbo visited Reichenau in 826, he could have met both Gottschalk and Walahfrid, who later praised the archbishop in verse written on behalf of Tatto, a Reichenau priest.¹³ Thus by the intercession of his episcopal allies and perhaps by having personally impressed the archbishop before, Gottschalk could have left Worms in Ebbo's entourage.

⁷ Dutton, *The Politics of Dreaming*, pp. 81–112; de Jong, *The Penitential State*, pp. 46–215; Courtney Booker, *Past Convictions: The Penance of Louis the Pious and the Decline of the Carolingians* (Philadelphia, 2009), esp. pp. 24–67; and Costambeys et al., *The Carolingian World*, pp. 217–21.

⁸ Lambot, "Lettre," pp. 45–51.

⁹ Traube, "Carmina," p. 728 and Lambot, "Lettre," pp. 41–2 and 45–51. The MS. is Paris B.N.F. lat. 2773, which is made up of what was originally two separate MSS, dated to the ninth and tenth centuries respectively. The verse letter appears in the first of these.

¹⁰ Lambot, "Lettre," pp. 46–51; de Jong, "Power and Humility," pp. 29–52; and Boshof, *Ludwig*, pp. 195–203.

¹¹ *MGH Cap.* II, No. 184, pp. 2–3; and Hartmann, *Die Synoden*, pp. 179–87.

¹² *Das Verbrüderungsbuch der Abtei Reichenau (Einleitung, Register, Faksimile)*, ed. Johanne Autenrieth, Dieter Geuenich, and Karl Schmid, *MGH Libri memoriales et necrologia nova series I* (Hanover, 1979), p. 98; and Goetting, *Bistum*, p. 63.

¹³ Walahfrid, *Ad Hebonem archiepiscopum Remensem in persona Tattonis*, *PLAC* II, pp. 350–1; and on Tatto, see id., *Visio Wettini*, *PLAC* II, pp. 301–33, here 302 and 331.

In 829 Ebbo was at the pinnacle of his career. Flodoard, the tenth-century Rheims historian, relates how his relationship with the emperor went back to childhood, when they had been *conlactatei* and *conscolastici*.¹⁴ According to a later letter from Charles the Bald, Ebbo was born of unfree parents on the royal fisc on the eastern side of the Rhine, a royal *cliens*, but was then freed by Charlemagne, enjoying the favor of both the emperor and his son thereafter.¹⁵ Ebbo assisted Louis in Aquitaine as his *bibliothecarius*, in charge of documents and probably codices, and then returned with him to Aachen following Charlemagne's death.¹⁶ He became archbishop of Rheims in 816/818 as Louis' preferred candidate, when the recently consecrated archbishop, Giselmair, was allegedly found inadequate in his knowledge of theology.¹⁷ Later Thegan, one of Louis' biographers and Ebbo's greatest critics, argued that Ebbo's low birth had made him unsuitable for high office and probably led to his betrayal of the emperor in 833; yet Flodoard, who had access to the archive and library of Rheims, assessed his early reign of the archdiocese in the highest terms.¹⁸

As archbishop Ebbo proved a leading advocate of moral reform of the clergy, an effective administrator of the see of Rheims and a useful political ally for the emperor, frequently serving him as a *missus*.¹⁹ In 823 he went on a successful mission to the Danes which helped lead to King Harald of Denmark's baptism at Mainz in 826.²⁰ Later that decade the epic poet and imperial biographer, Ermold the Black, emphasized Ebbo's holiness and learning in his *In honorem Hludowici*, in a short scene in which Louis commanded his *famulus*, "sacer Ebbo," to take the teachings of the Old and New Testaments to King Harald and the Danes so that they might be baptized and enjoy Christ's love.²¹ Ebbo also took a great interest in penance, which became a chief preoccupation among reformers in the 820s, and asked Halitgar of Cambrai to assemble a biblical and patristic florilegium dealing with penitential matters in detail.²² With Louis' support Ebbo restored St. Mary's

¹⁴ Flodoard, *Historia*, II, 19, ed. Stratmann, p. 175; and Sot, *historien*, p. 471.

¹⁵ Flodoard, *Historia*, II, 19, ed. Stratmann, p. 175; Charles the Bald, *Epistula V ad Nicholam*, PL 124: 870–5; Goetting, *Bistum*, pp. 56–8; and McKeon, "Ebbo," pp. 437–8.

¹⁶ Goetting, *Bistum*, pp. 57–9.

¹⁷ Goetting, *Bistum*, p. 59, and McKeon, "Ebbo," p. 438.

¹⁸ Thegan, *Gesta*, 56, ed. Tremp, p. 252 called Ebbo: "turpissimus rusticus;" and Flodoard, *Historia*, II, 19, ed. Stratmann, pp. 175–83.

¹⁹ Flodoard, *Historia*, II, 19, ed. Stratmann, pp. 175–83; Sot, *historien*, pp. 471–8; Goetting, *Bistum*, pp. 59–65, and McKeon, "Ebbo," pp. 438–9. Regarding his administrative activities, see Martina Stratmann, "De ministris Remensis ecclesiae. Eine Schrift Ebbos von Reims zur Diözesanverwaltung," in *Aus Archiven und Bibliotheken. Festschrift für Raymund Kottje zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Hubert Mordek (Frankfurt, 1992), pp. 121–35.

²⁰ *Annales regni Francorum*, s.a. 826, ed. Pertz and Kurze, p. 163; James Palmer, "Rimbert's *Vita Anskarii* and the Scandinavian Mission in the Ninth Century," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 55 (2004), pp. 235–56, here 250–5; Goetting, *Bistum*, pp. 61–2, and McKeon, "Ebbo," p. 439.

²¹ Ermold the Black, *In honorem Hludowici christianissimi caesaris augusti*, IV, ll. 1882–1993, ed. and trans. Edmond Faral, *Poème sur Louis le Pieux et épîtres au roi Pépin* (Paris, 1932), pp. 144–52.

²² Halitgar of Cambrai, *Liber poenitentialis*, PL 105: 651–710, regarding which see Raymond Kottje, *Die Bussbücher Halitgars von Cambrai und des Hrabanus Maurus: ihre Überlieferung und ihre Quellen* (Berlin, 1980); Flodoard, *Historia*, II, 19, ed. Stratmann, pp. 177–80 preserved an exchange of letters between Ebbo and Halitgar regarding this matter; Sot, *historien*, pp. 472; Goetting, *Bistum*, p. 61; and McKeon, "Ebbo," p. 438.

Cathedral at Rheims, where Remigius had baptized Clovis at the beginning of the sixth century, contributing to Rheims' rise to prominence as the coronation site of Frankish kings.²³ According to Flodoard, Ebbo was renowned as a man of letters, who sponsored the production of artistic masterpieces, such as the Ebbo Gospels and, perhaps, the Utrecht Psalter.²⁴

Ebbo's leading role in 829 in the reform synod of Paris is emblematic of his success as archbishop and as one of the emperor's most trusted advisors.²⁵ Doubtlessly Gottschalk hoped to emulate the archbishop's career and saw Ebbo's patronage as key to his future advancement into the highest circles of the church where political power, academic study, and spirituality were fused. The evidence for Gottschalk's relationship to Ebbo is his letter, in which Gottschalk characterized Ebbo as both lord and spiritual father, and described himself with terms of servitude as a servant (*famulus*), household servant (*vernaculus*), and dependant (*cliens*) of his lord.²⁶

Gottschalk's relationship with Ebbo was not an uncommon one: Carolingian lay and ecclesiastical *potentes* had many followers, dependants and hangers-on of various sorts. The ethical and moral understanding of bonds between lords and followers was a central feature of the aristocratic culture of power.²⁷ Lords generally provided financial support of various kinds and protection, as well as the highly important honor that came from being associated with them, while their followers performed different functions in return. The most important, however, was the followers' fidelity and public acknowledgement of their lesser status.²⁸

Gottschalk's descriptions of himself as Ebbo's client and servant followed the conventions set out by Carolingian formularies, where correspondents used terms such as *clientulus*, *servus*, and *vernaculus* for themselves when writing to bishops as lords and patrons to receive their favor.²⁹ These titles, along with careful

²³ Flodoard, *Historia*, II, 19, ed. Stratmann, pp. 179–80; Sot, *historien*, pp. 474–6; Goetting, *Bistum*, p. 59; and McKeon, "Ebbo," p. 438.

²⁴ Goetting, *Bistum*, p. 64 and Celia Chazelle, "Archbishops Ebbo and Hincmar of Reims and the Utrecht Psalter," *Speculum* 72 (1997), pp. 1055–77, who argues that the Utrecht Psalter was probably produced under Hincmar's auspices.

²⁵ No. 50D [Paris, 829], ed. Albert Werminghoff, *MGH Conc.* II, 2 (Hanover, 1906–8), pp. 605–80, on which see de Jong, "Ecclesia," pp. 129–31; Hartmann, *Synoden*, pp. 181–7; and Goetting, *Bistum*, p. 64.

²⁶ Gottschalk, *Domino clementissimo*, ed. Lambot, lines: 1, 7, 14, 20, 31, 34, 41, 46, 60, and 79 (Ebbo as *dominus*); 21, 29, 46, and 74 (*pater*); 26 and 82 (Gottschalk as *famulus*); 4, (*vernaculus*); and 71 (*cliens*), pp. 42–4.

²⁷ Althoff, *Family*, pp. 102–25; Susan Reynolds, *Fiefs and Vassals: The Medieval Evidence Reinterpreted* (New York, 1994), pp. 17–47 and 84–104; Innes, *State*, pp. 51–93; Julia Smith, *Europe after Rome: A New Cultural History, 500–1000* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 198–214; and Noble, "Secular," pp. 8–36.

²⁸ Althoff, *Family*, pp. 102–8 and Matthias Becher, *Eid und Herrschaft: Untersuchungen zum Herrscherethos Karls des Großen* (Sigmaringen, 1993), pp. 88–194. For a later period, see: Koziol, *Begging Pardon*, pp. 25–76.

²⁹ See, for example, *Formulae*, ed. Karl Zeumer *MGH Leges* V (Hanover, 1886), for *servus*, see pp. 47, 64, 117, 118, and 443; for *clientulus*, see pp. 261, 331, and 505; and for *vernaculus*, see p. 117. See also Alice Rio, *Legal Practice*, pp. 9–26 and pp. 48–9, 54–7, 89–90, 127, 131, 141–3, and 155–6 on the links between *formulae* and letters; Warren Brown, "Conflict, Letters, and Personal Relationships in the Carolingian Formula Collections," *Law and History Review* 25 (2007),

descriptions of the writers' circumstances, made explicit the terms of a patronage relationship in the letter.³⁰ As an intellectual seeking a bishop's aid, Gottschalk was not unusual: Alcuin referred to himself as *clientulus*, *servulus*, and *vernaculus* in letters to Charlemagne, bishops, and monks; and Lupus of Ferrières characterized himself and his monks as Bishop Folcric of Troyes' *clientes* when requesting his support.³¹

Gottschalk made very clear in his letter that Ebbo provided him not only with protection and support, but also with spiritual guidance and education.³² The description of Ebbo as Gottschalk's spiritual father, teacher, and protector fits well with the reconstruction of Ebbo from contemporary authors like Ermold and later ones like Flodoard, who regarded Ebbo as "an industrious and a well-lettered man" (*vir industrius et liberalibus disciplinis eruditus*).³³ Although Gottschalk claimed to have learned much from Ebbo himself, the archbishop's influence on his education also included making possible his studies at the monastery of Corbie.

Corbie was the preeminent center of scholarship in Ebbo's archdiocese, and it was closely associated with the archbishop through the mission to the Danes.³⁴ There Gottschalk met the future missionary to Denmark, Giselmar, and the teacher and intellectual, Ratramnus.³⁵ Gottschalk would seek out both monks as allies in the predestination controversy of the late 840s and 850s, and he probably first explored this doctrinal problem with these scholars during his stay at Corbie in the early 830s. Corbie was also attractive as a place of political power, since its abbot was the influential Wala, a cousin and former advisor of Charlemagne.³⁶ Corbie was, therefore, a place to study and to make important political connections for the future which would likely lead to missionary work.

Gottschalk's arrival at Corbie can be dated either to 829 or 830, based on his acquaintance with Giselmar. For Giselmar left Corbie in late 830 with Anskar as a missionary to the Danes.³⁷ Little more is known of Gottschalk's relationship with

pp. 323–44, here 327–33; and, for later medieval letter collections, Giles Constable, *Letters and Letter-Collections* (Turnhout, 1976).

³⁰ Carol Dana Lanham, "Freshman Composition in the Early Middle Ages: Epistolography and Rhetoric before the *Ars dictaminis*," *Viator* 23 (1992), pp. 115–34, here 120–7; and see also Mary Garrison, "Send More Socks: On Mentality and the Preservation Context of Early Medieval Letters," in *New Approaches to Medieval Communication*, ed. Marco Mostert (Turnhout, 1999), pp. 69–100; ead., "Praesagum," pp. 107–12; and Alice Rio, "Freedom and Unfreedom in Early Medieval Francia: The Evidence of the Legal Formulae," *Past and Present* 193 (2006), pp. 7–40.

³¹ Alcuin, *Epistolae* 31, 91, 229, and 284, *MGH Epp.* II, pp. 72–3, 135, 372–4, and 442–3; and Lupus, *Epistola* 125, ed. Peter Marshall, *Servati Lupi Epistolae* (Leipzig, 1984), pp. 117–19. On Alcuin's letters, see Donald Bullough, *Alcuin: Achievement and Reputation* (Leiden, 2002), pp. 35–109 and Garrison, "Praesagum," pp. 107–27, and ead., "Les correspondants d'Alcuin," in *Actes du colloque "Alcuin à Tours"*, ed. Philip Depreux and Bruno Judic (2004), pp. 319–32.

³² Gottschalk, *Domino clementissimo*, ed. Lambot, p. 43.

³³ Flodoard, *Historia*, II, 19, ed. Stratmann, p. 175.

³⁴ Ganz, *Corbie*, pp. 14–35 and Palmer, "Rimbert's," pp. 243–55.

³⁵ Jean-Paul Bouhot, *Ratramne de Corbie: histoire littéraire et controverses doctrinales* (Paris, 1976).

³⁶ Lorenz Weinreich, *Wala: Graf, Mönch und Rebell. Die Biographie eines Karolingers* (Lübeck, 1963), pp. 70–4; David Ganz, "The *Epitaphium Arsenii* and Opposition to Louis the Pious," in *CH*, pp. 537–50; and Depreux, *Prosopographie*, pp. 390–3.

³⁷ Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, p. 17 and Palmer, "Rimbert's," p. 243.

this monk except that Gottschalk sent him a treatise on predestination in 849 or early 850.³⁸ More, however, can be said about Gottschalk's other friend, Ratramnus. This monk of Corbie remains a somewhat elusive figure despite the survival of many of his writings on predestination, on the soul, and on Christ's body and blood.³⁹ He taught in Corbie's school, which catered in the 820s to Saxon converts, and wrote (so far as his works survive) exclusively on doctrinal issues rather than commenting on scripture.⁴⁰ Ratramnus emerged as a public intellectual figure in 843 when Charles the Bald (while visiting Corbie) asked him to write on Christ's body and blood; he was then asked again by the king to write on predestination in 849.⁴¹ As one of the leading minds at the preeminent intellectual center in the archdiocese of Rheims, it is hardly surprising that he was sought out by Gottschalk, who addressed him as a colleague and friend in a letter from 849.⁴² Perhaps Ratramnus' previous association with other Saxon pupils was significant for his relationship with Gottschalk. Yet their shared interest in theology seemed dominant, for both Gottschalk and his friend wrote about doctrine and years later both would explain the issues of predestination, the Trinity, and the Eucharist in similar ways.

Another important feature of life at Corbie when Gottschalk arrived there in 830 was that, under Abbot Wala's direction, the monastery had become a scene of political discussions and scheming that would lead to rebellion against Emperor Louis. Wala listened to the complaints of rebellious magnates, sent spies to court in order to discover Bernard of Septimania's alleged plans to murder the emperor and assume power himself with Empress Judith's help, and plotted Bernard's downfall and the restoration of the empire.⁴³ Ebbo for his part remained loyal to Louis in 830. He and his circle interpreted Gottschalk's presence at Corbie as involvement in the rebellion—whether genuine or not—and as treachery against the archbishop.⁴⁴ Gottschalk wrote in his letter to Ebbo that he was wrongly accused of leading a *negotium nefandissimum* against the archbishop and of committing a "crime against the name of the emperors" (*crimen contra nomen imperatorum*).⁴⁵ As Ildar Garipzanov has shown, a Carolingian ruler's *nomen*, or title, was seen as symbolic of his authority, making Gottschalk's alleged crime of the most serious and

³⁸ Hincmar, *Ad reclusos*, ed. Gundlach, pp. 261–2 and 271; and Traube, *PLAC* III, p. 714.

³⁹ Bouhot, *Ratramne*, pp. 11–23 and 69–75.

⁴⁰ Bouhot, *Ratramne*, pp. 71–3 and pp. 35–67; Pelikan, *Growth*, pp. 59, 72–88, 186, and 202–3; Ratramnus, *De praedestinatione dei*, ed. and trans. Timothy Roland Roberts (Dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1977), editor's introduction on pp. 19–42; Ganz, *Corbie*, pp. 70 and 87, and on Ratramnus' intellectual activities and Corbie MSS, see pp. 33–4, 56–7, 75–6 and 88–92; id., "Debate," pp. 289–91; id., "Theology," pp. 767, 770, 779–81, and 783; and Chazelle, *Crucified God*, pp. 169, 173, 180, 211–14, 227–30, and 232–8.

⁴¹ Ganz, *Corbie*, pp. 88–90 and Bouhot, *Ratramne*, pp. 77–88.

⁴² Traube, *PLAC* III, pp. 709 and 717; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, p. 17; Gottschalk, *Age quaeo*, *PLAC* III, pp. 733–7 and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 151–9 and 246–84, including a German translation of the text.

⁴³ Paschasius Radbert, *Epitaphium Arsenii*, II, 8–11, ed. Ernst Dümmler (Berlin, 1900), pp. 68–79; Weinreich, *Wala*, pp. 70–4; Ganz, "The *Epitaphium Arsenii*," pp. 537–50; and Depreux, *Prosopographie*, pp. 390–3.

⁴⁴ Goetting, *Bistum*, p. 56, and McKeon, "Ebbo," pp. 440–1.

⁴⁵ Gottschalk, *Domino clementissimo*, lines 41–7 and 62–4, ed. Lambot, pp. 43–4.

treasonous nature.⁴⁶ Gottschalk, however, claimed that he had been falsely accused by Ebbo's own followers, whom he had anticipated would defend him. Quite possibly they used Gottschalk's recent battle with Hrabanus to suggest his readiness for betrayal. To make matters worse, they had divided up Gottschalk's property (meaning whatever he had recovered from Fulda in 829) among themselves.⁴⁷

Implicated in the rebellion, Gottschalk must have been forcibly tonsured with the other lay conspirators on the emperor's orders, once Louis had recovered power that same year.⁴⁸ Wala himself was stripped of his office and imprisoned in a monastery.⁴⁹ Gottschalk's monastic incarceration probably occurred at Hautvillers, where Vielhaber hypothesized that he spent time as a monk in the early 830s, although Hincmar recorded later in the *Annales Bertiniani* that Gottschalk was an Orbais monk.⁵⁰ Vielhaber's argument was that Gottschalk had probably stayed at Hautvillers, Corbie, and Orbais in the 830s, since Haudoin of Hautvillers, Radbertus of Corbie, and Bavo of Orbais were the only abbots present at his condemnation at Quierzy in 849; Hincmar's choice of Hautvillers as the site of Gottschalk's imprisonment thereafter may have been connected with his earlier incarceration there.⁵¹

Gottschalk's stay at Hautvillers was probably the period when he perfected his mastery of Latin meter. Many modern critics have regarded him as one of the most innovative Carolingian poets.⁵² Verse writing was an important aspect of a Carolingian education and Gottschalk no doubt entered Hautvillers with some knowledge of meter.⁵³ In his letter to Ratramnus of 849 Gottschalk wrote that he had studied versification with a master for one year after his stay at Corbie, which corresponds well with the one year he spent at Hautvillers until Louis' reprieve of the conspirators in 831.⁵⁴ Traube argued that Gottschalk's use of hexameter showed similarities to other poems from the Rheims area, whose source he thought was the Irish scholar Dunchad, who supposedly taught at the monastery of St. Remigius.⁵⁵ While subsequent scholarship has rendered assertions about Dunchad's writings unsupportable, Gottschalk probably developed his poetic skills at Hautvillers under a teacher's guidance and soon began to display his own

⁴⁶ Garipzanov, *The Symbolic Language*, pp. 101–56.

⁴⁷ Gottschalk, *Domino clementissimo*, lines 15–77, ed. Lambot, pp. 43–4.

⁴⁸ Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici*, 45, ed. Tremp, p. 464.

⁴⁹ Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici*, 45, ed. Tremp, p. 462, and Weinreich, *Wala*, p. 75.

⁵⁰ *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 849, ed. Grat et al., pp. 56–7: "Godesscalcus Gallus quidam, monasterii Orbacensis parociae Suessionicae monachus et presbyter. . . ." See also Janet Nelson, "The 'Annals of St Bertin,'" in *CB*, pp. 23–40 and ead. (trans.), *The Annals of St-Bertin* (Manchester, 1991), pp. 14 and 67.

⁵¹ Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, p. 90, and Hincmar, *Liber*, 2, *PL* 125: 84–5.

⁵² Szövérfy, *Annalen*, p. 244; id., *A Concise History of Medieval Latin Hymnody* (Leiden, 1985), pp. 36–8; *Poetry of the Carolingian Renaissance*, trans. Peter Godman (Norman, OK: 1985), pp. 39–43; and Francesco Stella, "Gotescalco, la 'scuola di Reims' e l'origine della rima mediolatina," in *Il verso europeo. Atti del seminario di metrica comparata* (Firenze, 4 maggio 1994), ed. id. (Florence, 1995), pp. 159–65. See also Herding, "Dichtungen," pp. 46–7, who noted that previous assessments of Gottschalk's verse were mixed.

⁵³ Contreni, "Carolingian renaissance," pp. 753–6 discusses the place of verse in education.

⁵⁴ Gottschalk, *Age quae so*, lines 80–8, *PLAC* III, p. 735, and Weber, *Gedichte*, p. 156.

⁵⁵ Traube, *PLAC* III, pp. 710–11.

unique talents.⁵⁶ Hautvillers was certainly a place of learning in the ninth century, producing at least one other prominent intellectual, Almannus—a hagiographer, poet, and philosopher—and providing Gottschalk with the necessary books and resources to compose theological and grammatical treatises during his later imprisonment.⁵⁷

Gottschalk's authorship of the dedicatory verse of the Ebbo Gospel suggests that he managed to win the support of Abbot Peter during his incarceration. Scholarly consensus, based on metrical and linguistic similarities between this poem and those known to have been written by Gottschalk, agrees that he wrote the opening poem of the codex.⁵⁸ At Ebbo's command, this highly decorated manuscript was created at the abbey of Hautvillers under the auspices of Peter.⁵⁹ Had Gottschalk appealed to the abbot to advocate on his behalf with Ebbo and to allow him to write the poem in order to recover the archbishop's favor, then he would have been employing the tactic of developing allies that had previously proved successful. The poem praises Peter as "our humble abbot and gentle teacher" (*abba humilis noster Petrus placidusque magister*), and characterizes him as the archbishop's willing servant.⁶⁰ The poem's opening displays striking parallels with Gottschalk's view of Ebbo as a lord and spiritual protector with great learning in his verse letter:

Ebbo, glory of Rheims, bishop and illustrious pastor,
Brilliant, heavenly beacon, beloved by the saints throughout the ages,
Honor of every order and equally most pious hero,
Master of his own and our protector in all things,
Summit of bishops and sweet, noble light,
Model for all and our desired protection,
Standard for clerics and pious example of speech for the people,
Doctor of the Gospels, friend of the lofty king.⁶¹

⁵⁶ Stella, "Gotescalco," pp. 159–65; and Brunhölzl, *Geschichte*, p. 487.

⁵⁷ Almannus came from the generation after Gottschalk, being active in the late ninth century. See Manceaux, *Histoire*, pp. 267–79; André Wilmart, "La lettre philosophique d'Almanne et son contexte littéraire," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen-Âge* 3 (1928), pp. 285–320 (special thanks to Charles West for this citation); Pierre-André Sigal, "Les miracles de Sainte-Hélène à l'abbaye d'Hautvillers au Moyen-Âge et à l'époque moderne," *Actes du 97e Congrès national des Sociétés savantes*, Nantes, 1972. *Section de philologie et d'histoire jusqu'à 1610: Assistance et assistés jusqu'à 1610* (Paris, 1979), pp. 499–513; Dominique Poiré, "Un poème inédit d'Almanne de Hautvillers," *Revue d'histoire des textes* 24 (1994), pp. 275–90; Franca Ela Consolino, "L'invenzione di una biografia: Almanno di Hautvillers e la vita di Sant'Elena," *Hagiographica: Rivista di agiografica e biografia della Società internazionale per lo studio del Medio Evo latino* 1 (1994), pp. 81–100; and Ernesto Sergio Mainoldi, "Una proposta di nuova attribuzione ad Almanno di Hautvillers," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 76 (2009), pp. 7–28.

⁵⁸ Traube, "Carmina," p. 711; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 17 and 88–90; Fickermann, "Gottschalk," p. 88; Lambot, "Lettre," pp. 48–9; and Weber, *Gedichte*, p. 332–4.

⁵⁹ Chazelle, "Archbishops," p. 1074 suggests that (based on the fact that Ebbo's association with Louis the Pious was not mentioned in the poem) the manuscript was produced during his second tenure of office, 840–1, rather than in the early 830s.

⁶⁰ Gottschalk, *Ebbo Remense decus*, line 12, *PLAC* II, p. 623; and Weber, *Gedichte*, p. 186.

⁶¹ Gottschalk, *Ebbo*, lines 1–8, *PLAC* II, p. 623, and Weber, *Gedichte*, p. 186: "Ebbo, Remense decus, praesul pastorque coruscus,/ Celsa et clara farus, sanctis per saecula carus/ Ordinis omnis honos pariterque piissimus heros/ Atque sui compos quin noster ad omnia custos,/ Pontificum culmen seu

The juxtaposition of Peter as the *fidissimus minister*, *vernula fidus*, and *proles* with Ebbo as *celeberrimus magister*, *dominus*, and *pater* is quite like Gottschalk's portrayal of his own relationship with the archbishop in his letter.⁶² With abbot Peter's support, Gottschalk wrote first the dedicatory verses to the Ebbo Gospel, and then his verse letter in an effort to convince the archbishop he was innocent and to salvage his relationship with his patron, whose favor was important for both ending his imprisonment and restoring the chance for a career.

Ebbo had not only remained loyal to Louis in 830, but he also carried out the punishment of the disloyal clerics in his see. He probably supervised the deposition of Jesse of Amiens, one of his suffragans, who participated in the revolt,⁶³ and Ebbo probably oversaw Wala's removal from office, since Corbie fell within his episcopal jurisdiction. According to Gottschalk's letter, Ebbo believed the accusations made against his former client and he probably punished Gottschalk personally.⁶⁴ Hoping to escape his fate as a forcibly tonsured monk a second time, Gottschalk wrote his letter to Ebbo from the confines of Hautvillers in 831, when the emperor considered the fate of the traitors at assemblies at Compiègne and Nijmegen.⁶⁵

GOTTSCHALK'S *DOMINO CLEMENTISSIMO* (831)

Since its publication by Lambot in 1958, Gottschalk's letter to Ebbo has not been subject to any scholarly examination beyond connecting its author with the archbishop.⁶⁶ The letter consists of eighty-four lines of rhyming prose, consisting of an introduction (lines 1–14), a claim that the accusation of treachery against Ebbo is false (lines 15–61), a plea for Ebbo's help against the charge that he committed treason against the emperors (lines 62–77), and a closing section with a prayer (lines 78–84).⁶⁷ Gottschalk's main strategy in the letter for saving himself from imprisonment was to cast himself as Ebbo's loyal client, wrongfully convicted as a traitor to his patron and the emperor. Letters like Gottschalk's preserved in formularies were often written to resolve disputes and conflicts.⁶⁸ Such letters placed the correspondents within the "web of patron/client or lord/man connections," emphasizing that their association generally involved figures in both vertical and horizontal relationships, who sought to mediate or influence the outcome of a dispute.⁶⁹ More than likely such letters were used to help Gottschalk obtain his hearing at the Synod of Mainz, 829 not long before.

dulce et nobile lumen,/ Cunctorum specimen nostrumque optabile tegmen/ Et cleri norma et vulgi pia
famine forma,/ Doctor euangelicus, praeceps regis amicus."

⁶² Gottschalk, *Ebbo*, lines 19–22, *PLAC* I, p. 624, and Weber, *Gedichte*, p. 186.

⁶³ Thegan, *Gesta*, 37 and 44, ed. Tremp, pp. 222–4 and 236.

⁶⁴ Gottschalk, *Domino clementissimo*, lines 20–5, ed. Lambot, p. 43.

⁶⁵ *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 831, ed. Grat et al., p. 3.

⁶⁶ Ganz, "Debate," p. 287; Weber, *Gedichte*, p. 11. Lambot, "Lettre," pp. 45–6 provided a French paraphrase of the letter.

⁶⁷ Lambot, "Lettre," p. 48.

⁶⁸ Brown, "Conflict," pp. 323–44.

⁶⁹ Brown, "Conflict," p. 335.

In this tradition, Gottschalk emphasized how his relationship with Ebbo extended vertically up to God: Christ was Gottschalk's heavenly patron, who would judge both Gottschalk and Ebbo for their (mis)deeds. This network of relationships gave Gottschalk the basis on which to lay out a path of thought in his letter: one that would lead Ebbo to see the injustice of Gottschalk's conviction. This pathway was marked with signs for the reader in the form of carefully-selected textual allusions to biblical and exegetical works, and by following these path marks Ebbo was to discover that Gottschalk's condemnation had been unjust and Christ would exact vengeance on him for abusing his office as judge and for betraying his loyal client. Gottschalk's message, therefore, was embedded in the letter and, as we shall see, recognizable only to readers familiar with a particular exegetical tradition.

To begin with, Gottschalk asserted his loyalty to Ebbo as his lord and spiritual father by contrasting himself with those of Ebbo's followers who, he claimed, had formed a conspiracy against the archbishop. By this strategy Gottschalk meant to single himself out for fidelity and to emphasize the hardships his loyalty had brought him, as this passage from the letter demonstrates:

Indeed after I, the most wretched of the Christian people, was recently torn away from the most gentle side of my helmsman, just as befalls one who is hammered by waves in his ship and knocked about from all sides—an oarsman lost! Multiple, or may it be said, countless anxieties besieged me so that I am compelled to cry aloud and say: "Wake up! Why are you sleeping, lord?" The greatest of these anxieties I must confess is that I, father—it affects me with the greatest mortification to hear it!—have been accused by you of shameless opprobrium against your name worthy of the most wretched Judas, and that I am not only a supporter, but even the author and head of all the efforts against you.

For when I, the least of all your servants, heard, I soon went with suppliant prayers to my omnipotent lord, in so far as he also brings aid in this matter to his completely unworthy client, so that you, most outstanding father, might not believe any of it before testing it by investigation and careful discussion. Because now I also pray in a most suppliant voice that you, my most pious lord, will not scorn to do so quickly so you might know, and the rest should too, that I would prefer to die by the giving, commanding God, rather than plot such treacheries against my lord.

This then has been the tinder of all my anxieties, and why the goads of various calamities have begun to rise up against me. And if it might be permitted for me (not by my merits) to come before you, I shall unravel the circumstance and sequence of them for you, my comforter.

For with deep feeling I assert to you, most reverent lord, one thing, that I choose the disfavor of all those subject to you rather than adhere to a partnership in this kind of most abominable affair, since I believe unquestioningly that if I should be deprived of my head, the association of the members would stay together in vain; also God's wrath would doubtlessly arise against me, should defamation against my most venerable lord, or rather my most pious father, be carried out—God forbid!—by me.⁷⁰

⁷⁰ Gottschalk, *Domino clementissimo*, lines 15–47, ed. Lambot, p. 43: "Postquam etenim ipse, gentis videlicet miserrimus christianae, a placidissimo nuper gubernatoris mei diremptus sum latere, sicuti solet illi accidere, qui in navi fluctibus tunditur undisque percellitur, amisso remige, multifariae, immo etiam si dici liceat, anxietates me vallaverunt innumerae, ita ut etiam vociferare compelleret

By praying to Christ as his patron, Gottschalk placed his relationship with Ebbo in the greater cosmic hierarchy, indicating to the archbishop that he was reaching over him to the very summit of power for help in this matter. At the time of Gottschalk's letter even the emperor had performed public penance in 822 for the death of conspirators whom he had condemned to punishment as well as for the sins of his reign and that of his father Charlemagne, and Ebbo would have clearly understood the implications of Gottschalk's appeal to Christ as the ultimate patron.⁷¹ In framing his plea in this fashion, Gottschalk combined what he no doubt hoped were effective prayers to Christ with his message to Ebbo that he was innocent. Gottschalk's suffering—being “torn away” from his patron, “hammered” and “knocked about” in a sea of calamity, and even “besieged” by “countless anxieties”—was highlighted alongside his humble, but true loyalty and fear of divine wrath. Indeed, Ebbo was to see how disloyalty to his lord was both impossible and shameful for Gottschalk. Under the pressure of these claims, Ebbo would be moved to ask himself whether he *had* wrongfully condemned his client.

Here we see Gottschalk developing for the first time in his own words an image of himself as God's suffering, innocent, and loyal servant; this was an image he would employ throughout the rest of his life as part of his ongoing tendency to see himself as wrongfully persecuted by unjust authorities. Seeking Christ's aid as his loyal servant was a commonplace in the liturgy, as is evidenced in the Gelasian sacramentaries first developed in Pippin I's era and in the Gregorian sacramentaries from Charlemagne's reign onwards.⁷² In the liturgy, the clergy and congregation

et dicere: Exurge, quare obdormis domine? Quarum quidem maximam fateor esse, quod me, pater, contigit audisse summa cum mortificatione, vobis assertum fuisse, in vestri me calumniam nominis, instar Iudae miserrimi, in vobis impudenter transiluisse, meque, ne dico fautorem, verum etiam auctorem et caput totius in vos moliminis existisse. Quod ubi ego, vestrorum scilicet famulorum extremus audivi, subplicibus mox omnipotentem dominum ad precibus ivi, quatenus suo, undique licet indigno, ad hoc etiam opem ferret clienti, ne prius vos, pater praestantissime, inde crederetis ulli, quam illud probaretis indagine et discussione subtili. Quod et nunc quoque voce vos piissimum dominum meum deprecor valde subplici, ut hoc facere non dedignemini tempore veloci, qualiter sciatis vos, sciant et reliqui, quod dante deo iubente ego malim mori, quam meo haec domino molimina machinari. Hinc igitur meorum ortus est fomes anxietatum, et hinc mihi variarum insurgere coeperunt stimuli calamitatum, quarum si mihi fuerit, meis et si non meritis, ante vos venire permissum, consolatori meo retexam eventum et ordinem ipsum. Unum tamen, vobis, reverentissime domine, visceraliter assero, quia omnium vobis subditorum offensionem potius eligo, quam in huiusmodi negotio illorum nefandissimo adhaerere consortio, quoniam illud indubitanter teneo, quod si capite carvero, frustra membrorum adhaereat conexio, dei quoque procul dubio in me fit irritatio, si in venerabilissimum dominum meum, immo patrem piissimum, a me exerceatur, quod absit, infamatio.”

⁷¹ Chazelle, *Crucified God*, deals with this topic as a whole, but see especially pp. 14–37; Rachel Fulton, *From Judgement to Passion: Devotion to Christ and the Virgin Mary, 800–1200* (Columbia, 2002), pp. 54–7; Adolf Katzenellenbogen, “The Image of Christ in the Early Middle Ages,” in *Life and Thought in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Robert Hoyt (Minneapolis, 1967), pp. 66–84; and Eric Miller, *The Politics of Imitating Christ: Christ the King and Christomimetic Rulership in Early Medieval Biblical Commentaries* (Dissertation, University of Virginia, 2001). For a specific case, see Martin Claussen, “God and Man in Dhuoda's *Liber manualis*,” in *Women in the Church*, ed. W.J. Sheils and Diana Wood, *Studies in Church History* 27 (Oxford, 1990), pp. 43–52. On Louis' penance of 822, see de Jong, *Penitential*, pp. 122–32.

⁷² Yitzhak Hen, *The Royal Patronage of Liturgy in Frankish Gaul to the Death of Charles the Bald (877)* (London, 2001), pp. 57–61 on the Gelasian sacramentary and pp. 74–81 on the Gregorian.

regularly described themselves as God's *famuli* and *servi* when seeking divine aid in mournful and suppliant tones.⁷³ Gottschalk's image of himself as Christ's client was, therefore, founded on a wider tradition, since clerics and especially monks in the eighth and ninth centuries were addressed with the humble title, *servi Dei*.⁷⁴ Yet Gottschalk's choice of "client" rather than the more typical terminology of servitude shows that he, quite uniquely, wanted to stress Christ's role as a patron who protects and helps his follower achieve things in the world.

The term *cliens Christi* appears in ninth-century hymns and poetry, and Gottschalk was one of its earliest innovators.⁷⁵ That it was a designation he was attached to is attested by its occurrence in his surviving hymns. Of his twelve surviving metrical works, two hymns—*Christe mearum* and *Spes mea Christe*—include self-references as *cliens Christi*. These hymns share several verses, which may indicate that they were originally one longer hymn or that alternate versions of the hymn existed, and Traube argued that these were Gottschalk's first poems, written sometime in the early 830s.⁷⁶ Here is a translation of part of *Spes mea Christe* which demonstrates how Gottschalk constructed the image:

My hope, Christ, blessed king, pious light of life
and expert leader, pastor worthy of love and reverence,

On early medieval and Carolingian liturgy in general, see also Cyrille Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, trans. and rev. William Storey and Niels Krogh Rasmussen (Washington, 1986), although the author does not generally consider the cultural significance of the liturgy; Donald Bullough, "The Carolingian Liturgical Experience," in *Continuity and Change in Christian Worship*, ed. R.N. Swanson, *Studies in Church History* 35 (Rochester, 1999), pp. 29–64; id., "Alcuin and the Kingdom of Heaven: Liturgy, Theology and the Carolingian Age," in *Carolingian Renewal: Sources and Heritage* (Manchester, 1991), pp. 161–240; Hen, *Culture and Religion*, passim but esp. pp. 43–60; McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 115–54; and Arnold Angenendt, "Die Liturgie und die Organisation des kirchlichen Lebens auf dem Land," in *Cristianizzazione ed organizzazione ecclesiastica delle campagne nell'alto medioevo: espansione e resistenze*, *Settimane* 28 (1982), pp. 169–234.

⁷³ See, for example, the *ordo missae* in *Le sacramentaire Grégorien. Ses principales formes d'après les plus anciens manuscrits*, 1; 6, 11, 13 bis and 14, ed. Jean Deshusses, vol. I (Fribourg, 1971), pp. 87 (*famuli* and *famulae*), 89 (*servi*) and 90 (*famuli* and *famulae*). For an example of the Gelasian tradition (with some Gregorian additions) associated with Charlemagne's court, see *Liber Sacramentorum Gellonensis*, ed. Antoine Dumas, CCSL 99 (Turnhout, 1981), where the term *famulus* is employed hundreds of times when asking for divine aid; see, for example, pp. 4, 31, 33, 36, 41, 42. For *servus* see *Liber Sacramentorum Gellonensis*, ed. Dumas, pp. 47, 49, 51, 83, 94, 96. See also Albert Blaise, *Le vocabulaire latin des principaux thèmes liturgiques*, rev. Antoine Dumas (Turnhout, 1966), pp. 52, 99, 173–7, and 182–7 with more examples. On the Gellone Sacramentary, see Chazelle, *Crucified*, pp. 81–99.

⁷⁴ For the use of *servi Dei* for clerics, see: *MGH Conc.* II, No. 1 [742], 2 and 7, pp. 1–4, here 2, 3 and 4; *MGH Conc.* II, No. 2 [743], 2, pp. 5–7, here 7; *MGH Conc.* II, No. 4 [Soissons, 744], 2 and 10, pp. 33–6, here 33, 34 and 36; and *MGH Conc.* II, No. 6 [747], pp. 45–50, here 47. *Servi Dei* appears to have been used increasingly for monks in the ninth century; see, for example, *MGH Conc.* II, No. 53, pp. 688–94, here 688 and 693.

⁷⁵ Searches in the *Patrologia Latina*, *Corpus Christianorum*, and *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* databases have not revealed earlier references. For other ninth-century examples, see Wandalbert of Prüm, *Ymnus in omnes sanctos*, st. 1, *PLAC* II, p. 603; Mico/Fredigar, *De nostro miserrimo casu*, ll. 1–4 and 25–8, *PLAC* III, pp. 328 and 329; Sedulius Scottus, *Ad Karolum Calvum*, 6, 2, ll. 54–6, *PLAC* III, p. 258; and Heiric of Auxerre, *Vita sancti Germani*, VI, 360–4, *PLAC* III, p. 510.

⁷⁶ Gottschalk, *Christe, mearum*, and *Spes mea Christe*, *PLAC* III, pp. 724–6; and Traube, *PLAC* III, pp. 710. See also Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 135–9 and for analysis pp. 189–210.

Highest creator and restorer, be unto me a patron
 and always a leader, be my animator and restorer . . .
 Look upon your weeping client, I ask,
 Fearing and seeking you, revering and loving you . . .⁷⁷

The uniqueness of Gottschalk's self-representation in these two hymns and his letter suggests very strongly that he wrote them during the same period he was a prisoner at Hautvillers. Once again confined to the cloister and out of favor with his earthly patron, Gottschalk put himself in the role of a client who had turned to Christ for help, and then called upon that aid when approaching Ebbo in his letter.

Gottschalk's self-characterization as Christ's client was a play on his own Latinized Germanic name—*Godes-scalcus*—which meant "servant of God." Ninth-century glosses list *scal* as the equivalent of *servus* and *cliens*, which were both terms that Gottschalk would use in his Latin texts to describe himself.⁷⁸ "*Cliens*" was synonymous with the more common monastic terms of "*servus*" and "*famulus*," as is demonstrated, for example, in Smaragdus of Saint-Mihiel's commentary on Donatus' *Ars major*.⁷⁹ His commentary was popular in the ninth century, surviving in twelve manuscripts, including one at Corbie where Gottschalk could have encountered it.⁸⁰ "'Client,'" Smaragdus wrote, "is understood as 'servant' and 'friend.'"⁸¹ In this way, *cliens* captured both the Roman concept of dependent friendship that embodied ancient patron-client relationships, and the Christian idea of service, used to describe the faithful in relation to God.⁸²

Moreso than his client-patron terminology, Gottschalk's literary allusions mark the path leading to the deeper layers of meaning in his text. Carolingian authors used allusions in their texts in order to create the possibility of multiple or multi-layered meanings for their particular audience.⁸³ Gottschalk worked in this manner

⁷⁷ Gottschalk, *Spes mea Christe*, PLAC III, pp. 725–6, verses 1–2 and 4: "[1] Spes mea, Christe, rex benedice, lux pia vite, duxque perite, pastor amande seu venerande, [2] Summe creator et reparator, sis mihi factor semper et auctor, sis animator et recreator . . . [4] Respice flentem, quaeso, clientem, te metuentem atque petentem, te venerantem, quin et amantem," and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 137–9, here 137–8.

⁷⁸ *Chronologisches Wörterbuch*, ed. Seebold et al., p. 736; and *Die althochdeutschen Glossen*, ed. Steinmeyer and Sievers, IV, p. 345, 29.

⁷⁹ *Mittelateinisches Wörterbuch bis zum ausgehenden 13. Jahrhundert*, ed. Otto Prinz et al. (Munich, 1999), II, pp. 721–2; and Smaragdus, *Liber in partibus Donati*, ed. Bengt Löfstedt, L. Holtz and A. Kibre, CCCM 68 (Turnhout, 1986). See also Jean Leclercq, "Smaragde et la grammaire chrétienne," *Revue du moyen âge latin* 4 (1948), pp. 15–22 and Law, "Study," pp. 100–3.

⁸⁰ On the MSS see *Liber in partibus Donati*, ed. Löfstedt et al., pp. xix–xx and xxii; Louis Holtz, "La tradition ancienne du *Liber in partibus Donati* de Smaragde de Saint-Mihiel," *Revue d'histoire des textes* 16 (1986), pp. 171–211, here 194–5; and Ganz, *Corbie*, p. 150, who estimates that the MS is a mid-century product based on its perfected Caroline script.

⁸¹ Smaragdus, *Liber in partibus Donati*, ed. Löfstedt et al., p. 225: "PRO: PRO CLIENTE; cliens enim et servus et amicus."

⁸² For Roman notions of clientage, see Matthias Gelzer, *The Roman Nobility*, trans. Robin Seager (Oxford, 1969), pp. 70–100; Ernst Badian, *Foreign Clientelae, 264–70 BC* (Oxford, 1958); Richard Saller, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* (1982), pp. 7–40; and Peter Brunt, *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 382–422. For the Christian Roman period, see Kate Cooper, *The Fall of the Roman Household* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 93–142.

⁸³ See, for example, Jean Meyers, *L'art de l'emprunt dans la poésie de Sedulius Scottus* (Paris, 1986), pp. 203–4, who argues that Sedulius Scottus crafted the allusions in his texts specifically for his

in his letter to convey layered meanings to his chief audience, Ebbo, in order to bring him to his ultimate message. When Gottschalk described himself in the letter as an oarsman knocked out of the boat without his pilot's knowledge, Gottschalk included a quotation to Psalm 43, 23: "Wake up! Why are you sleeping, Lord?" This quotation is the first textual clue to understanding Gottschalk's deeper meaning to Ebbo. Psalm 43 is a message to God from a faithful servant, formerly supported and protected in the past but now forsaken, which has caused him and Israel to fall into the power of their enemies. The psalmist's message of despair is worth citing:

All of these things have befallen us and we did not forget you, and we did not betray your covenant,

And our heart has not turned [away from you]. And you deflected our paths from your way,

Since you humbled us in the place of affliction, and the shadow of death overwhelmed us.

If we forgot your name, and if we opened our hands to another god, would not God have found these things out?

For he knows the secrets of the heart. Thus on account of you we are being worn to death each day, and are deemed lambs for the slaughter.

Wake up! Why are you sleeping, Lord? Wake up, lest you spurn [us] to the end!

Why do you turn your face away, forgetting our need and tribulation?⁸⁴

The psalmist's message to God was that he and Israel were loyal to their Covenant with him, but nevertheless the deity had abandoned them to their enemies. By quoting this psalm, Gottschalk sought to emphasize to Ebbo the similarity between his own situation and that of the psalmist: he had been loyal to his patron, but still Ebbo had abandoned him to his enemies. If Gottschalk identified with the psalmist, he encouraged Ebbo to see himself in the role of God as a protector who allowed his follower to suffer. With such identifications, however, Ebbo could have also understood that the words of the psalmist in the letter amounted to a prayer to God as well as to himself, placing the archbishop again between his former client and his potentially-wrathful divine patron.

Gottschalk also used New Testament imagery to describe his situation and further lead his reader to his embedded message. With his description of himself

intended audience. On the study of literary allusions, especially in the Roman tradition, see Joseph Pucci, *The Full-Knowing Reader: Allusion and the Power of the Reader in the Western Literary Tradition* (Yale, 1998); Stephen Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge, 1998); Lowell Edmunds, *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry* (Baltimore, 2001); and Aaron Peltari, *The Space that Remains: Reading Latin Poetry in Late Antiquity* (Ithaca, 2014).

⁸⁴ Ps 43, 18–24: "[18] haec omnia venerunt super nos nec obliti sumus te et inique non egimus in testamento tuo [19] et non recessit retrorsum cor nostrum et declinasti semitas nostras a via tua [20] quoniam humiliasti nos in loco adfflictionis et cooperuit nos umbra mortis [21] si obliti sumus nomen Dei nostri et si expandimus manus nostras ad deum alienum [22] nonne Deus requireret ista ipse enim novit abscondita cordis quoniam propter te mortificamur omni die aestimati sumus sicut oves occisionis [23] exurge quare dormis Domine exurge et ne repellas in finem [24] quare faciem tuam avertis oblivisceris inopiae nostrae et tribulationis nostrae."

as an oarsman thrown out of his boat and separated from his helmsman by a storm, Gottschalk was suggesting that Ebbo and he were like Christ and one of Christ's disciples. Cassiodorus had characterized the disciples as oarsmen (*remiges*) and Christ as the pilot (*gubernator*) in his *expositio* of Psalm 106, and Remigius of Auxerre (ca. 841–908) would use the same image in a homily on the Gospel of Matthew.⁸⁵ Before them Ambrose in a letter and Augustine in his explanation of Psalm 103 had identified Christ as a ship's pilot as well.⁸⁶ What is more, Gottschalk's image of Ebbo and himself as Christ and disciple in a boat on stormy waters was like the Gospel story of Christ calming the stormy sea after being woken up by his disciples, fearing for their lives:

And he said to them on that day when it became late, "Let us cross to the other side." And dismissing the crowd, they took him in a boat and other boats were with him. And a great windstorm arose and sent waves into the boat so that it was being filled [with water]. He was in the stern sleeping on a pillow, and they woke him and said: "Teacher, does it not matter to you that we are dying?" And standing up he threatened the wind, and said to the sea: "Quiet! Stop!" And the wind ceased and there was great tranquility. And he said to them: "Why are you afraid? Do you not have faith?"⁸⁷

The Gospel story, much like Psalm 43, reveals Christ's followers in trouble while he seems unaware of their danger. The story served as another biblical narrative which emphasized Gottschalk's loyalty to Ebbo in the face of accusations. Yet Gottschalk's description of himself as an oarsman "who in the boat is beaten by waves and knocked from all sides" (*qui in navi fluctibus tunditur undisque percellitur*) does not include direct quotation or allusion to any of the Gospel accounts. Mark wrote that the storm "sent waves into the ship so that it was being filled [with water]" (*fluctus mittebat in navem ita ut impleretur navis*). The other Synoptic Gospels include a similar account: Matthew 8, 24 wrote that the storm was so strong that "the little boat was being overwhelmed with waves" (*navicula operiretur fluctibus*), and Luke 8, 23 recorded that the disciples "were being overwhelmed and endangered" (*et complebantur et periclitabantur*) in the boat. Although the disciples in these accounts wake Christ for fear of the storm, there is no allusion in any of the Gospels to Psalm 43, as in Gottschalk's text.

In fact, the Gospel story was not normally linked to Psalm 43 by Latin authors up to Gottschalk's time. Two Corbie texts, however, do connect the Gospel story of Christ and his disciples in the storm with Psalm 43, and these works could have provided Gottschalk with models for associating the psalm verse with the Gospel

⁸⁵ Cassiodorus, *Expositio Psalmorum*, CVI, 23, ed. Marcus Adriaen, *CCSL* 97–98 (Turnhout, 1958), pp. 979–80; and Remigius of Auxerre, *Homelie in Mattheum*, *PL* 131: 865–932, here 916.

⁸⁶ Ambrose, *Epistulae*, V, 16, 5, ed. Otto Faller, *CSEL* 82 (Vienna, 1968), p. 143: "bonus gubernator"; and Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, CIII, 4, 5, ed. Dekkers and Fraipont, p. 1524.

⁸⁷ Mc 4, 35–9: "[35] Et ait illis illa die cum sero esset factum transeamus contra [36] et dimittentes turbam adsumunt eum ita ut erat in navi et aliae naves erant cum illo [37] et facta est procella magna venti et fluctus mittebat in navem ita ut impleretur navis [38] et erat ipse in puppi supra cervical dormiens et excitant eum et dicunt ei magister non ad te pertinet quia perimus [39] et exurgens comminatus est vento et dixit mari tace obmutesce et cessavit ventus et facta est tranquillitas magna [40] et ait illis quid timidi estis necdum habetis fidem."

narrative. The first was in the *Breviarium in Psalmos*, a commentary on the Psalms made up of the writings of Jerome and other anonymous authors.⁸⁸ The Corbie copy of this text was heavily glossed in Gottschalk's day, which suggests that it was popular and therefore Gottschalk and Ebbo both may have known it.⁸⁹

The second Corbie work was Radbertus' *magnum opus*, his *Expositio in Matheo* in twelve books, many of which were completed before and while Gottschalk was at Corbie.⁹⁰ Radbertus (785–ca. 865) was another of the monastery's great intellectuals, and Gottschalk probably met him, along with Ratramnus and Giselmair, while he was there. In addition to his numerous theological works, Radbertus has recently been linked to the Pseudo-Isidorean forgeries created in Corbie during the rebellions against Emperor Louis in the 830s, contributing to a wider conspiratorial atmosphere in the monastery while Gottschalk was there.⁹¹ Radbertus' interpretation of the Gospel story in question was influenced by the *Breviarium* account, which gives further evidence that this work was part of the scholastic life at Corbie.

In an excerpt taken from Jerome's *Tractatus in Psalmos*, the *Breviarium* linked Gospel story and psalm verse in the exposition of Psalm 81, 1, in a passage that reads: "God stood in the synagogue of the gods" (*Deus stetit in synagoga deorum*). When explaining why the psalmist wrote that God "stood" in the synagogue, the author added other incidents describing God as if he had a body, which included the story of Christ sleeping in the boat during the storm:

We have said about God that according to some he stands, according to others he walks, and indeed according to others he sits either as a king or as a judge, while indeed according to others he sleeps. If he sometimes abandons us to temptations, though we may be holy, we are nevertheless left to temptations so that we may be tested, at which time the Lord "sleeps" for us. Thus says the psalmist: "Wake up! Why are you sleeping, Lord?" And the Apostles, when they were in the boat, and the boat was repeatedly beaten by the waves, their Lord was sleeping among them. For that reason the boat was being beaten by the waves. And then they wake him, and once awakened the tempest immediately grows quiet.⁹²

⁸⁸ *Breviarium in Psalmos*, PL 26: 821–1270, here 960. The compiler is believed to have been either from late fifth-century Gaul or seventh/eighth century Ireland. See Eligius Dekkers and Aemilius Gaar, *Clavis Patrum Latinorum* (Steenbrugge, 1995), p. 218. The MS is Paris B.N.F. Lat. 12150. On the contents of the *Breviarium*, see Germain Morin, "Praefatio," in Jerome, *Commentarioli in psalmos*, ed. Germain Morin, CCL 72 (Turnhout, 1959), pp. 165–74, here 165–7; and Martin McNamara, *The Psalms in the Early Irish Church* (Sheffield, 2000), p. 49.

⁸⁹ On the MS, see Ganz, *Corbie*, p. 156.

⁹⁰ Paschasius Radbertus, *Expositio in Matheo libri XII*, ed. Beda Paulus, CCCM 56–56B (Turnhout, 1984).

⁹¹ On Paschasius' work, see Anton Schönbach, "Über einige Evangelienkommentare des Mittelalters," *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften Wien* 146 (1903), pp. 1–175, here 142–74; Henri Peltier, *Pascase Radbert* (Amiens, 1938), pp. 100–2; Gerard Mathon, "Pascase Radbert et l'évolution de l'humanisme carolingien," *Corbie, abbaye royale* 13 (1963), pp. 135–55; Brunhölzl, *Geschichte*, pp. 370–2; Ganz, *Corbie*, pp. 82–4. On the Pseudo-Isidorean forgeries, see Klaus Zechiel-Eckes, *Fälschung als Mittel politischer Auseinandersetzung. Ludwig der Fromme (814–840) und die Genese der pseudoisidorischen Dekretalen* (Paderborn, 2011); and *Fälschung als Mittel der Politik? Pseudoisidor im Licht der neuen Forschung. Gedenkschrift für Klaus Zechiel-Eckes*, ed. Karl Ubl and Daniel Ziemann (Wiesbaden, 2015).

⁹² *Breviarium*, PL 26: 1126: "Diximus de Deo, quod aliis stet, aliis ambulet, aliis vero sedeat : aut quasi rex, aut quasi iudex : aliis vero dormit. Si quando nos derelinquit tentationibus, licet simus

The passage compares the evangelists' description of Christ asleep to occasions when Christians are subject to temptation, an interpretation based on Christ's chastisement of the disciples for losing faith on account of the storm. Here the psalmist's words were brought together with the Gospel story, and it was recorded twice that "the ship was being beaten by the waves" (*navis fluctibus tundeatur*). This is nearly identical with Gottschalk's description of himself as an oarsman "in the boat being beaten by the waves" (*qui in navi fluctibus tunditur*). Coupling this allusion with the quotation from Psalm 43, it seems quite certain that Gottschalk was drawing from the *Breviarium* to make his Gospel comparison.

That Radbertus, who served as a teacher and preacher within Corbie, also drew from the *Breviarium* suggests further that the text was part of the intellectual life in the monastery.⁹³ When explaining the story of the storm on the sea in his *In Matheo*, Radbertus also quoted Psalm 43, 23 and interpreted the story as symbolic of the temptations suffered by Christians who turn to Christ for help:

But the foreseeing power of Christ does everything either so as to increase the faith from a miracle or to teach something out of a mystery. For not the mildness of serenity, but the savageness of the tempest proves the experience of the pilot. For this reason, then, Christ ascends into the boat since out of this he can teach how from the beginning of the world he mightily directs his church while testing it. And what the apostles did after they saw that human frailty's experience of piloting had failed, discerning that the sea raged more and the whirling of the winds collided more and more against the water—this the disciples of Christ do every day while the church is tested. Therefore soon they flee rightly to the helmsman of [all] things, to the conqueror of the world, to the lord of the elements, seeking that he should calm the press of the wave and remove the danger of temptation and restore salvation for those laboring. And this is what we sing in the psalm: "Wake up! Why are you sleeping, Lord? Wake up lest you spurn us to the end." For he never sleeps, who guards and governs the church among the crashes of the world. But whenever he does not offer help to those tested, it is said that he "slept." Therefore as he sleeps, the ship, that is the church, and those who are in it, he rules, since faith thereby is strengthened against temptations all the more for victory.⁹⁴

sancti : tamen relinquitur tentationibus ut probemur : eo tempore nobis dormit Dominus. Denique quid dicit psalmista: Exsurge, ut quid dormitas, Domine? Et apostoli, quando erant in navi, et navis fluctibus tundeatur, dormiebat eis Dominus : Propterea enim navis fluctibus tundeatur. Denique excitant eum, et evigilat, et statim tempestas quiescit." Jerome, *Tractatus in Psalmos*, 81, 1, ed. Germain Morin, CCL 78 (Turnhout, 1958), pp. 1–447, here 83–4.

⁹³ Mathon, "Pascase Radbert," pp. 135–55.

⁹⁴ Paschasius Radbertus, *Expositio*, V, lines 1244–62, ed. Paulus, p. 501: "Sed agit provida Christi virtus omnia quatinus et fides augeatur de miraculo et aliud doceatur interius ex mysterio. Nam gubernatoris peritiam non probat temperies serenitatis sed inmanitas tempestatis. Ergo Christus tunc ascendit in navicula quando ex hoc doceret quid ab initio seculi potens in sua dum pereclitatur agit ecclesia. Et quod fecerunt apostoli postquam viderunt peritiam deperisse gubernandi humane fragilitatis cernentes mare quod amplius seiret et turbines ventorum quod contra fluctus magis magisque confiderent hoc cottidie discipuli Christi agunt dum periclitatur ecclesia. Mox ergo iure confugiunt ad gubernatorem rerum ad triumphatorem seculi ad elementorum Dominum petentes ut fluctus mitiget pressurarum, periculum submoveat temtionis, salutem restituat laborantibus. Et hoc est quod in psalmo canimus: Exsurge quare obdormis Domine? Exsurge et ne repellas in finem. Non quod umquam dormiat qui custodit inter fragores seculi ecclesiam et gubernat. Sed quotiens

Radbertus' use of the psalm and his interpretation of the story to represent the temptations suffered by Christians reveal his borrowing from the *Breviarium*. None of the predominant Gospel commentaries used by Radbertus that deal with this episode (Augustine's *De consensu evangelistarum*, Jerome's commentary on Matthew, or Bede's commentaries on Luke and Mark) interpreted it as analogous of temptations in the world.⁹⁵

This study is the first to show that Gottschalk learned a very particular tradition of understanding this gospel story in connection with Psalm 43, 23, stemming from the *Breviarium* and fostered at Corbie under the leadership of Radbertus. Fresh from the intellectual environment of the monastery, Gottschalk drew on this tradition when he composed his letter to Ebbo at Hautvillers. By suggesting to the archbishop a comparison between themselves and Christ and a disciple, Gottschalk sought to show that he, like the apostles in the boat, was loyal to his lord but in danger and perhaps even tempted to despair. Ebbo, like the sleeping Christ, was unaware of the "storm" in which Gottschalk found himself, because of the accusations his followers had made about his client. Thus Gottschalk was calling upon Ebbo to "wake up" and calm his storm—to imitate Christ as the protector of his disciple.

Thus far we have investigated the strategies Gottschalk employed to convince Ebbo of his innocence and loyalty: his status as Christ's client, the meaning of his quotation of Psalm 43, 23, and comparison of the archbishop and himself as Christ and disciple. Turning now to the final section of his letter, we will uncover yet another reading of Gottschalk's message for Ebbo: an admonition from the *Breviarium*. The section of the *Breviarium* connecting Psalm 43, 23 with the gospel story about Christ and his disciples in the boat was an explanation of Psalm 81, which is fundamentally a critique of unjust judges. There are strong resonances of this criticism in the last section of Gottschalk's letter, and Gottschalk must have intended for Ebbo, who like his client could have known this passage of the *Breviarium* from his contact with Corbie, to remember the text and recognize that the psalmist's admonition and the commentary applied to the archbishop himself.

By including criticism of Ebbo in his letter, Gottschalk was working in the tradition of admonition (*admonitio*) developed in the empire in the 820s. At this time, first the emperor and then his bishops adopted a discourse of public criticism to warn those involved in scandals, which brought divine wrath down on the church and empire, to repent their wrongful acts.⁹⁶ Such admonitions were

pereclitantis non prebet auxilium quasi obdormisse dicitur. Ergo unde ille obdormit inde navis videlicet ecclesia et qui in ea sunt regitur quia exinde fides contra temptationes amplius ad victoriam eruditur."

⁹⁵ Augustine, *De consensu evangelistarum libri quattuor*, II, 24, ed. Franz Weihrich, *CSEL* 43 (Vienna, 1904), pp. 157–8; Jerome, *Commentariorum in Matheum libri IV*, I, lines 1170–93, ed. David Hurst and Marcus Adriaen, *CCSL* 77 (Turnhout, 1969), p. 52, uses the story as occasion to discuss signs of Christ's power in the world, noting that the men in the boat were *not* Christ's disciples, because they could not recognize him as the Messiah. Bede, *In Lucae evangelium expositio*, III, lines 547–95, ed. David Hurst, *CCSL* 120 (Turnhout, 1960), pp. 180–1, and id., *In Marci evangelium expositio*, II, lines 1–58, ed. David Hurst, *CCSL* 120 (Turnhout, 1960), pp. 489–90 in both cases interprets the story as figurative of Christ's passion and resurrection.

⁹⁶ de Jong, *Penitential*, pp. 112–47. On scandal, see also de Jong, "What was public," pp. 863–902.

sometimes leveled even at the emperor himself and his advisors, as in the case of Archbishop Agobard of Lyons, who frequently sent warnings to the court about God's anger over the state of the realm.⁹⁷

Before looking at the *Breviarium's* explanation of Psalm 81 and Gottschalk's admonition of Ebbo, however, let us examine the remainder of Gottschalk's letter:

Thus I know for certain, o foremost of the men of God, that whereas at this time there is a conspiracy of many against me, there will be no one whose entreaty on behalf of your little servant will beat at the ears of my lord, except that I should be effaced from the world. For now among worldly men an accusation against the name of the emperors has been brought against me, and what is more this move against me was committed—how sad!—by those whom I would have hoped would be my defense. Now among strangers I am disgraced—how unspeakable!—by my own people, and I am prejudged first by them rather than by my lord, since because of their hatred these [enemies] do not see that I await the judgement of a different judge, and not one as cruel as them; I await the sentence of a clement protector, who is not diverted from what is right to cause injury for any amount of money, because he always hopes to please the eyes of his heavenly father. Therefore for the condemnation of your client, many are now given my parent's goods, and not only strangers, but even my own associates. I then have nothing to give anyone, but I offer only myself as remuneration to you, father, and I rightly offer myself to you totally, because you offered me up, or rather, returned me to the omnipotent God. Indeed it would be incomparably better for me to lose the companionship of the brothers, rather than the solace of my father. Since I speak [at greater length] perhaps than I ought, but I have not completely exhausted my need, . . . lord, at last I finish this plaintive letter with this ending: Christ, guiding rule of the rich and true salvation of the poor, may you guide your servant in this world for a long time, and after the running of many years, may you add him to the consortium of saints.⁹⁸

Gottschalk accused Ebbo's followers of conspiring against him and robbing him of his inherited property, rather than defending him as he had expected. Whether guilty or not, Gottschalk's connection with Corbie and his separation from the archbishop enabled them to accuse him of participating in the Loyal Rebellion.

⁹⁷ de Jong, *Penitential*, pp. 142–7.

⁹⁸ Gottschalk, *Domino clementissimo*, lines 58–84, ed. Lambot, p. 44: "Proinde scio, praecipue virorum dei, pro certo, quia cum plurimorum hoc in tempore erga me futura sit conspiratio, nullius pro servulo vestro aures domini mei pulsabit obsecratio, nisi tantum ideo ut delear de saeculo. Enim vero iam mihi contra imperatorum nomen apud saeculi homines impingitur crimen, et hoc etiam illorum, pro dolor, mihi machinatur molimen, quos mihi speraveram futuros esse minime. Iam a meis ad alienos, pro nefas, infamor, et prius ab illis quam a domino meo diiudicor, non intuentibus prae odio <inimicis>, quod alterius ego praestoler iudicium iudicis, et non crudelis ut illi, sed clementis expectem sententiam vindicis, qui nullis ab iure ad iniuriam flectitur nummulis, quia semper optat placere patris superni oculis. Igitur pro vestri damnatione clientis, pluribus iam dantur mei bona parentis, et non solum alienis, verum etiam meis. Ego autem quid alicuidem non habeo, sed tantum me ad mercedem accumulandam vobis, pater, offero, et merito me vobis totum exhibeo, quia vos me exhibuistis, immo reddidistis omnipotenti deo. Incomparabiliter siquidem mihi melius est fratrum carere consortio, quam patris mei solatio. Quia loquor <prolixius> fortasse quam debeo, sed tamen necessitatem meam non expleo, a . . . domine, sub tandem lugubrem epistolam hoc fine determino: Christus forma divitum, salusque certa pauperum, vestrum vos ad gubernandum famulum, conservet hoc in saeculo per <pro>lixium spatium, et post multorum curricula annorum, vos adgreget consortio sanctorum."

Gottschalk quickly focused on what he wanted from Ebbo: to act as a merciful protector rather than as a “cruel” judge seeking wealth over justice. He no longer had anything to offer the archbishop, and therefore Gottschalk’s status as a client was that much more important: without Ebbo as a patron he was powerless and unprotected. Gottschalk, however, framed his appeal within the sphere of his relationship with God. He said it was right to give himself to Ebbo, since the archbishop had returned him to God, referring to Ebbo’s earlier favor. He ended with a prayer that Ebbo, God’s servant, be joined after a long life to the community of the saints, which was a final show of good will and loyalty to a fellow servant of God.

The last path mark in Gottschalk’s letter leads to the *Breviarium*. Imprisoned now in Hautvillers, Gottschalk had *already* been condemned by Ebbo. His letter indicates that the archbishop believed the charges against him and therefore must have passed sentence on him. Gottschalk hoped that Ebbo would recall the *Breviarium*’s exposition of Psalm 81 from his quotation of Psalm 43, 23 and his characterizations of himself and the archbishop as disciple and Christ in the gospel story. Following the passage from the *Breviarium* quoted above was this condemnation of unjust judges and of bishops in particular taken from Jerome (the words of Psalm 81 are distinguished by quotation marks):

“How long will you judge unjustly?” God himself is speaking to his judges, that is, to the princes of the people. Those verses that follow refer specifically to judges. If they are judges of the world, [the meaning] is clear. But if they are judges of the church, we are to understand [the verses to be] about bishops and priests. “How long will you judge unjustly?” He who judges unjustly is a judge of iniquity. The gospel was about a judge of iniquity where it says: “he did not fear the Lord, and he did not respect a human being.” “How long will you judge unjustly?” I gave you power over my flock, and over the people of God: you ought to be judges, and not wolves. “And you take on the appearance of sinners. Give justice to the needy and the orphan, protect the rights of the lowly and the poor! Rescue the pauper and the needy,” and so on. When a dispute comes to you, you do not examine the case, you do not examine the law, but the status of those who bring the case. As if to say, if a poor man comes, having a just case, and a rich man, having an evil one, you look to their status, not their claim. So it is according to one interpretation. But there is another, more mystical one. In the theater one man is accustomed frequently to play different roles. At one time he enters as a woman, another as a man, one time as a king; one man who had entered as a king, then does so again as a slave. I have given the example so that we might go from the carnal to the spiritual. We also take up different roles. For when I am angry, I assume the role of a lion. When I seize another’s property, I assume that of a wolf. And when I am cruel and commit murder, I assume the role of a cruel man. But when those who are sinners play different roles in their sins, so they are the opposite of the saints, who play different roles for the good. When I give alms, I take up the role of a merciful man. But when I judge well, I assume the role of a good judge. But when I suffer harm, and I am humble, I take up the role of a humble person. Unhappy is he, who assumes many roles for the worse. Happy is he, who adopts different ones for the better.⁹⁹

⁹⁹ *Breviarium*, PL 26: 1127: “‘Usquequo judicatis iniquitatem?’ Ipse Deus loquitur ad iudices, hoc est, ad principes populi. Specialiter isti versiculi qui sequuntur, ad iudices dicuntur. Si saeculi iudices,

With these passages from Psalm 81 about unjust judges, the *Breviarium* encourages Christians to act justly, humbly and overall “for the better.” The critique is aimed at bishops who unjustly judged their congregations, arguing that they were men who did not fear God. Such judges of iniquity were wolves, who (as is noted later in the exposition) stole from their flock. Judges should help the poor when they have a righteous case, and not simply look at the standing of the wealthy when their case was unjust. In his letter Gottschalk portrayed himself as a poor client, bereft of his inheritance and in need of a judge who seeks to please God rather than obtain wealth. Ebbo was to recall the *Breviarium* text and understand that his condemnation of his client had been unjust: he was a judge of iniquity, who neither cared for justice nor feared God, and any property he himself had seized from his client made him a wolf.

As in the case of his pleas for help from the archbishop, Gottschalk placed his critique of Ebbo within the wider bounds of his patronage from God. He hoped to remind Ebbo that the deity stood above them both: he heard Gottschalk’s prayers and scripture spoke on his behalf. Gottschalk’s message was that just as God urged Ebbo to see that he was mistaken to believe his followers’ accusations, so also did he, Gottschalk, denounce the archbishop for unjustly condemning him. Here Gottschalk most clearly articulated for the first time what would become in subsequent decades a recurrent theme about himself as God’s servant wrongfully persecuted by unjust religious authorities.

His letter to Ebbo was the product of his association with Corbie, in the sense that his connection with the monastery led to the charges of treason, creating the necessity for the letter itself, and also for the particular textual borrowings and influences drawn from the monastery’s intellectual culture. It gives us an example of the fruits of his experience, which involved reading biblical texts and commentaries, and no doubt discussing them in the highly-charged atmosphere of Corbie. There Gottschalk learned to employ his knowledge of biblical imagery and commentary with the discourse of *admonitio* from the 820s in ways that demonstrate the nuanced connections between political power, monastic scholarship, and the

manifestum est. Si vero ecclesiae iudices, de episcopis intelligamus atque presbyteris. ‘Usquequo iudicatis iniquitatem?’ Qui iudicat iniquitatem, iudex iniquitatis est. Ille erat iudex iniquitatis, de quo dicitur in evangelio: qui dominum non timebat, et hominem non reverebatur. ‘Usquequo iudicatis iniquitatem?’ Dedi vobis potestatem in gregem meum, et in populum dei: debetis iudices esse, et non lupi. ‘Et facies peccatorum sumitis. Iudicate egeno et pupillo, humilem et pauperem justifyate. Eripite pauperem, et egenum’ et cetera. Quando venerit ad vos iudicium, non consideratis causam, non consideratis iudicium, sed personas eorum qui habent causas. Ac si dicat: Si venerit pauper, habens iustum negotium, et venerit dives, habens malum negotium: vos personam aspicietis, non negotium. Hoc interim secundum unam interpretationem. Caeterum est et alia interpretatio sacratio. Solet in theatris unus homo frequenter diversas habere personas: nunc ingreditur in mulierem, nunc in virum, nunc in regem, et qui in regem processerat, rursum in servo procedit. Dixi exemplum, ut de carnali venire possimus ad spirituale. Et nos diversas personas accipimus. Quando enim irascor, personam leonis assumo. Quando res alienas rapio, lupi personam assumo. Quando vero crudelis sum et interficio, assumo personam crudelis. Sed quomodo qui sunt peccatores, in peccatis habent diversas personas, sic e contrario qui sancti sunt, habent et ipsi diversas personas, sed in bono. Quando eleemosynam facio, habeo personam quasi clementis. Quando vero bene iudico, habeo personam boni iudicis. Quando vero injuriam patior, et humilis sum, habeo personam humilis. Infelix est, qui plures in malo habet personas. Felix est, qui diversas personas habet in bono.” Jerome, *Tractatus in Psalmos*, 81, 2–4, ed. Morin, pp. 84–5.

production of literary works. His letter shows great skill in combining a humble plea with stern admonition with the goal of disturbing the archbishop enough so that he would see his former client in an exceptionally more favorable light.

Whether Gottschalk won Ebbo's favor again or not with his letter, like all the lesser traitors of 830, his sentence would have been commuted in 831. At that time Louis ordered the release of those forcibly cloistered, allowing them to recover their lost properties and to leave the monastery if they desired.¹⁰⁰ If reconciled with Ebbo, Gottschalk could have enjoyed the benefits of Ebbo's favor for three more years. As a follower of Ebbo, Gottschalk may have taken part in the dramatic rebellion of 833, in which Louis was overwhelmed and deposed by forces commanded by his son and co-emperor Lothar—events in which Archbishop Ebbo played a leading role among the imperial bishops supporting the uprising by personally helping to convince Emperor Louis to make a public confession of his unworthiness to rule at St. Medard, to surrender his office, and to adopt the life of a penitent.¹⁰¹ According to the vituperative royal biographer Thegan, Ebbo himself placed the penitential garments on the former emperor.¹⁰² Gottschalk, as one of the archbishop's followers, could have witnessed this event firsthand and perhaps even participated in it himself in an assisting role. With Louis' restoration in 834, however, Ebbo fled his see with much of his episcopal treasure, allegedly seeking to escape by ship with the aid of the Danes, although he was captured before leaving the mainland.¹⁰³ Having played such a leading role in Louis' removal from power, Ebbo bore the brunt of the emperor's subsequent wrath and was made an episcopal scapegoat.¹⁰⁴ Ebbo was incarcerated at Fulda until his hearing at the assembly of Thionville in 835 where, following the advice of his *confessores*, he composed a *libellus* in which he declared himself unfit for episcopal office and resigned in shame.¹⁰⁵ He remained imprisoned in various monasteries until Louis' death in 840.¹⁰⁶

CONCLUSION

Gottschalk's letter reveals fascinating aspects of his experiences in the early 830s. First, it indicates that Gottschalk moved among the highest circles of ecclesiastical power—including Archbishop Ebbo and Abbot Wala—and that his connections to

¹⁰⁰ Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici*, 46, ed. Tremp, p. 466.

¹⁰¹ Flodoard, *Historia*, II, 20, ed. Stratmann, p. 185; Thegan, *Gesta*, 44, ed. Tremp, pp. 232–8; *Annales Bertini*, s.a. 833, ed. Grat et al., pp. 8–11; de Jong, "Power," pp. 29–52; Goetting, *Bistum*, pp. 65–6; and McKeon, "Ebbo," p. 442.

¹⁰² Thegan, *Gesta*, 44, ed. Tremp, p. 232: "Post libertatem vestivit te purpura et pallio, tu eum induisti cilicio."

¹⁰³ Flodoard, *Historia*, II, 20, ed. Stratmann, pp. 184–5; *MGH Conc.* II, No. 61 [Ingelheim, 840], *Narratio clericorum Remensium*, pp. 806–14, here 807; and Goetting, *Bistum*, p. 67.

¹⁰⁴ For recent revaluations of Ebbo's case, see Booker, *Past Convictions*, pp. 183–97; de Jong, *Penitential*, pp. 76–9 and 252–9; and Patzold, *Episcopus*, pp. 193–9.

¹⁰⁵ *MGH Cap.* II, No. 199, pp. 57–8; *MGH Conc.* II, No. 55 [Thionville, 835], pp. 696–703; Goetting, *Bistum*, pp. 67–8; and McKeon, "Ebbo," p. 443.

¹⁰⁶ Goetting, *Bistum*, pp. 68–9.

these figures embroiled him in the turbulent politics of the moment. While saying definitively that Gottschalk actively took part in any of the rebellions is impossible, nevertheless his association with these powerful figures suggests some kind of involvement. Quite likely Gottschalk understood his possibilities for a future career hinged on his loyalty to these men in trying circumstances. The second fascinating revelation of Gottschalk's letter is that he had mastered the complex mode of communication and thought involving Latin rhythmic prose, textual allusions, and a sophisticated, multi-layered message. Indeed, the letter's embedded message indicates that even in a dire situation Gottschalk could deftly join personal humility with severe criticism of the powerful, in effect overturning the existing state of affairs for his audience by subverting its view of things. Effecting such a powerful transformation of an audience's perspective would become Gottschalk's signature mode of operation as a thinker in the late 830s and 840s, and it would enable him to offer a startling, new moral vision of the cosmos in that troubled time.

In a wider historical sense, Gottschalk's use of the concept of *cliens Christi* was a fascinating development in the history of Christian thought, one that linked notions of one's personal religious attachment to a timeless deity with a message to one's earthly and very historical patron. Gottschalk would employ versions of this tripartite configuration throughout the rest of his life as he developed a remarkable sense of individual purpose as a theologian, missionary, one of God's elect, and even a martyr. This unique unfolding of his thought makes Gottschalk a significant figure both in the tradition of medieval European spirituality and of medieval and post-medieval, would-be reformers and dissenters. As so many others in these groups, Gottschalk interpreted the timeless truth of scripture as speaking directly to his very particular historical circumstances and, in a phenomenological sense, to his experiences of the world.

As an intellectual in the post-patristic age, Gottschalk could avail himself of accepted patristic (and pseudo-patristic) texts as well as scripture, which offered him a large pool of material for developing and legitimizing his claims. Weaving them together in a wholly unique pattern, Gottschalk transformed these textual authorities into the threads of a sophisticated argument in which the spiritual *was* the political, and the political *was* the spiritual. Likewise, his readers were to see that his subjective perspective of events was really nothing short of self-evident, objective reality on both an earthly and heavenly scale. Therefore, his audience—whether human or divine—should act in his interest and further his goals. While we do not know how successful Gottschalk was in these terms in the early 830s, a more abundant body of extant sources will make it possible to evaluate his successes and failures in subsequent decades in greater detail.

3

A Missionary of Grace, ca. 835–848

In the late 830s, Gottschalk conceptualized salvation in a novel and startling way: no one—whether baptized or not—would enjoy eternal salvation without the grace of election. While he developed his doctrine from largely-forgotten patristic and especially Augustinian teachings, Gottschalk’s presentation of grace was an unexpected and startling message when the empire’s rebellions of the 830s gave way to bloody civil war in the early 840s. Gottschalk sought to force Christians to reevaluate the possibility for eternal life in an atmosphere of anxiety and doubt by demanding that bishops preach his doctrine and that believers confess it, lest they be shown to be among the reprobate. During the late 830s and 840s, Gottschalk preached his doctrine first in Italy and then outside the empire in Dalmatia, Croatia, and among the Bulgars until he was convicted of heresy and physically punished for being “impervious to reform” (*incorrigibilis*) at the Synod of Mainz in 848.¹

This chapter examines the development of Gottschalk’s doctrine and his teaching methods, and traces his path as a would-be reformer and missionary through the Carolingian Empire and beyond. Since the surviving evidence remains limited and much of it comes from subsequent decades, reconstructing the historical Gottschalk of this period continues to involve uncertainty and speculation.² Yet careful analysis of this material reveals insights into Gottschalk’s ideas and activities: he continued to seek out influential patrons as he had earlier in order to further his ambitions, and his startling doctrine and great powers of persuasion were directed at bringing changes to the Frankish church as well as converting non-Christians. Inherent to Gottschalk’s message was a strong sense that the elect must be distinguished on earth in the here and now as they were in eternity, and for this reason he sought to “awaken” the elect with the revelation of his doctrine and to separate them from the unbelieving reprobate, including other Christians. Gottschalk’s activities as a missionary of grace suggest that he saw his own role in this process as absolutely key. Central to these developments was that Gottschalk’s old enemy, Hrabanus Maurus, watched his activities carefully from the north and demanded resistance to Gottschalk’s teachings from Italian bishops and nobles. The result was the beginning of what is generally called the Carolingian predestination controversy, which would continue through the 850s.

¹ Hrabanus’ letter to Hincmar, preserved in Hincmar, *Liber*, PL 125: 84–5, and reprinted in *MGH Conc.* III, No. 16 [Mainz, 848], p. 184.

² For earlier reconstructions of his career in this period, see Traube, *PLAC* III, pp. 709–11; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 16–18; Boller, *Gottschalk*, pp. 49–56; and Genke, *Gottschalk*, pp. 27–38.

Gottschalk's concept of predestination and Hrabanus' anti-Gottschalkean response offer an amazing opportunity for examining how Carolingian intellectuals developed arguments in support of their doctrines and what role theology played in imperial culture. In Gottschalk's case, it is important to focus not only on his doctrine, but also on his methods of debate and argumentation as they can be gleaned from later sources. Gottschalk's Latin hymns also provide essential insights into how his seemingly rigid and disturbing doctrine could be understood as a message of hope. Hrabanus' surviving treatises and letters from the early 840s offer evidence for his arguments that Gottschalk's doctrine was essentially superfluous as well as heretical and evil, while Hrabanus claimed his own doctrine constituted traditional and universally-accepted church teachings about grace. The result of their dispute was that the Synod of Mainz (848) under Hrabanus' leadership condemned Gottschalk of heresy in an effort to stop his preaching and protect the church from the dangers of his ideas.

RECONSTRUCTING GOTTSCHALK AS MISSIONARY AND THEOLOGIAN

Not long after Archbishop Ebbo's disgrace in 835 for his participation in the failed rebellion against Louis the Pious, Gottschalk became a monk at the monastery of Orbais, where he began to teach as a *magister* and was soon ordained to the priesthood.³ While the circumstances of his conversion at Orbais are unknown, Gottschalk must have been trying not only to avoid any fallout from his association with Ebbo but also to continue developing his career as a missionary monk. Evidence that Gottschalk was a famous teacher in the see of Rheims comes from Hincmar's later interpolations in the *Annales Bertiniani* (perhaps written in the 860s) and his predestination writings (849–59).⁴ While hostile and designed further to discredit the already-condemned Gottschalk, the archbishop acknowledged that earlier he “seemed monastic in habit and speech” (*habitu et sermone, ut videbatur, religioso*) and “respectable” (*honestus*),⁵ and that his ideas allowed him often to draw pupils away from other teachers.⁶ This teaching was Gottschalk's rehearsal for his preaching activities in Italy and outside the empire. Reconstructing a portrait of Gottschalk as teacher and priest before his condemnation in 848 requires careful examination of his later writings as well as those of his enemies, works that will then be examined again in their specific historical context.

How Gottschalk ultimately became a missionary must be pieced together from various sources. His key contact seems to have been the marcher lord Eberhard of Friuli, with whom Victor Genke suggests Gottschalk became acquainted through

³ Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 214–68; Pelikan, *Growth*, pp. 81–95; Ganz, “Debate,” pp. 299–300; id., “Theology,” pp. 772–3; and Chazelle, *Crucified God*, pp. 181–95.

⁴ *Annales Bertini*, s.a. 849, ed. Grat et al., pp. 56–7; Hincmar, *Ad reclusos*, ed. Gundlach, pp. 260–1; id., *Liber*, 2, PL 125: 84–5; and *MGH Conc.* II, No. 18 [Quierzy, 849], pp. 195–6.

⁵ Hincmar, *Ad reclusos*, ed. Gundlach, pp. 260–1.

⁶ Hincmar, *Liber*, 2, PL 125: 84–5.

the intervention of his friend, Walahfrid, while the latter served as chaplain to Empress Judith in the mid-830s.⁷ A letter from Hrabanus to Eberhard from the mid-840s explicitly links Eberhard with Gottschalk, indicating that Gottschalk was a frequent presence in Eberhard's household.⁸ Eberhard was one of the great magnates of the Carolingian world, who became one of Emperor Lothar's most important supporters during the civil wars of the early 840s; he commanded the crucial border region of Friuli, an area that connected Carolingian Italy with the Slavic lands to the east, and he assisted during the 840s and 850s in protecting Italy from Slavic and Muslim attacks on numerous occasions.⁹ In 835/836 Eberhard married Gisela, Judith and Louis the Pious' daughter, giving Walahfrid an opportunity to recommend Gottschalk as a candidate for missionary work to the empress. As marcher lord of Friuli and in close proximity to Aquileia, which had a tradition of converting the Slavs east of the empire, it is not difficult to see how Eberhard must have been deeply concerned about missionary work there.¹⁰ Gottschalk as a learned monk from the Rheims area and recommended by the empress herself on the word of her chaplain was an excellent candidate for such a task. Whether Abbot Bavo of Orbais agreed with the arrangement is uncertain, however, since Hincmar would later repeatedly claim that Gottschalk had left his monastery irregularly.¹¹ Nevertheless, the Rheims chorbishop Rigbold, who fulfilled the duties of archbishop in Ebbo's absence, ordained Gottschalk so that like other Carolingian missionary monks he could begin his work.¹² For whatever reason, Gottschalk's ordination was done without the knowledge of Bishop Rothad of Soissons, Gottschalk's bishop, which would later be used to discredit Gottschalk's ordination by his enemies in 849.¹³

Gottschalk seems to have developed his doctrine of grace during the early 830s, which—as noted previously—was a time of rebellion and uncertainty, when it was difficult for rulers, bishops, and the nobility to be certain who held legitimate authority. After Louis the Pious died in 840, the tensions of the previous decade

⁷ Genke, *Gottschalk*, pp. 26–7.

⁸ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 42, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 481–7, here 481.

⁹ On Eberhard, see Harald Krahwinkel, *Friaul im Frühmittelalter: Geschichte einer Region vom Ende des fünften bis zum Ende des zehnten Jahrhunderts* (Vienna, 1992), pp. 245–66; Cristina La Rocca and Luigi Provero, "The Dead and Their Gifts. The Will of Eberhard, Count of Friuli, and His Wife, Gisela, Daughter of Louis the Pious (863–864)," in *Rituals of Power from Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Janet Nelson and Frans Theuws (Leiden, 2000), pp. 225–80; and Paul Kershaw, "Eberhard of Friuli, a Carolingian Lay Intellectual," in *LI*, pp. 77–105.

¹⁰ Giuseppe Custicito, "Aquileia e la cristianizzazione degli slavi nei secoli VIII–IX. Un problema storiografico," *Atti e memorie della Società istriana di archeologia e storia patria* 36 N.S. (1988), pp. 37–75, but esp. pp. 58–60; and Heinz Dopsch, "Zur Missionstätigkeit des Patriarchats Aquileia in Kärnten," *Studien zur Geschichte von Millstatt und Kärnten. Vorträge der Millstätter Symposien 1981–1995*, ed. Franz Nikolasch (Klagenfurt, 1997), pp. 11–29.

¹¹ *Annales Bertini*, s.a. 849, ed. Grat et al., pp. 56–7; Hincmar, *Liber*, 2, *PL* 125: 84–5; and *MGH Conc.* II, No. 18 [Quierzy, 849], pp. 195–6. On Bavo see du Dubout, *Histoire*, pp. 198–204.

¹² Hincmar, *Liber*, 2, *PL* 125: 84–5; and *MGH Conc.* II, No. 18 [Quierzy, 849], pp. 195–6. On the connection between ordination and mission, see Palmer, "Rimbert's," p. 245.

¹³ *Annales Bertini*, s.a. 849, ed. Grat et al., pp. 56–7; Hincmar, *Liber*, 2, *PL* 125: 84–5; and *MGH Conc.* II, No. 18 [Quierzy, 849], pp. 195–6.

ultimately culminated in civil war and the division of the empire.¹⁴ The deep anxieties of this period are preserved in sources that lament the horrors of the conflict between the Christians as well as the political dismemberment of the empire.¹⁵ For example, Florus of Lyons, in his poem lamenting the division of the empire, wrote that the whole universe grieved for the Franks who had risen to the heights of empire, but were now fallen into the dust because of their hardened hearts and sinful infighting, a state of wickedness that caused God to punish the realm severely:¹⁶ “Everything is laid waste by the afflictions of horrendous calamity” (*Omnia vastantur horrendae cladis erumnis*), while “the fighting nobility savagely make corpses of one another,/ the earth swims with blood, everywhere seethes with plundering,/ and criminal madness runs wild having broken its reins” (*Nobilitas discors in mutua funera saevit,/ Sanguine terra madet, fervescent cuncta rapinis,/ Et rabies scelerum ruptis discurrit habenis*).¹⁷ The poet Angelbert, who took part in the most intense fighting at the Battle of Fontenoy on June 25, 841, mourned that brothers killed brothers, uncles slew their nephews, and even sons failed to give fathers their due so that the souls of those involved in the conflict fell plummeting into Hell.¹⁸ He described the slaughter at that battle: “The dead are stripped,/ the buzzard, the crow and the wolf devour their flesh./ They grow stiff without graves—the corpse lies helpless” (*nudati sunt mortui,/ horum carnes vultur, corvus, lupus vorant acriter:/ orrent, carent sepulchris, vanum iacet cadaver*).¹⁹

In the atmosphere of existential uncertainty that grew out of this period of conflict, church councils in the mid-840s repeatedly worked to reestablish order and correct the errors that the years of violence and warfare had unleashed: corruption was to be stamped out, discord and hostilities were to stop, offences threatening the purity of the church were to end, the various social and ecclesiastical orders—including monks—were to return to their rightful places, and all were to accept correction by their rulers and bishops.²⁰ Imperial order, even in the divided empire, was to be restored in each of the kingdoms. Yet Gottschalk’s teachings

¹⁴ Dutton, *The Politics of Dreaming*, pp. 113–56; and Costambeys et al., *The Carolingian World*, pp. 379–88.

¹⁵ For a discussion of these sources, see the references in the previous note and Ganz, “The Debate on Predestination,” pp. 283–7.

¹⁶ Florus, *Querela de divisione imperii*, PLAC II, pp. 559–664, here ll. 1–12, pp. 559–60; and *Poetry*, trans. Godman, pp. 50–1 and 264–73, which includes facing English translations.

¹⁷ Florus, *Querela de divisione imperii*, ll. 10 and 22–4, PLAC II, p. 560. See also the discussion of Florus’ lament in Kershaw, *Peaceful Kings*, pp. 197–203.

¹⁸ Angelbert, *Rhythmus de pugna fontanetica*, PLAC II, pp. 137–9; see also Godman, *Poetry*, pp. 48–50 and 262–4.

¹⁹ Angelbert, *Rhythmus*, st. 14, PLAC II, p. 139.

²⁰ Moore, *A Sacred Kingdom*, pp. 348–67; and Thomas Bauer, “Kontinuität und Wandel synodaler Praxis nach der Reichsteilung von Verdun: Versuch einer Typisierung und Einordnung der karolingischen Synoden und *concilia mixta* von 843 bis 870,” *Annuaire Historiae Conciliorum* 23 (1991), pp. 11–115. For the councils, see: *MGH Conc.* III, 1. [Germigny-des-Prés, 843], pp. 1–7; *MGH Conc.* III, 3. [Coulaines, 843], pp. 10–17; *MGH Conc.* III, 4. [Toulouse, June 844], pp. 18–23; *MGH Conc.* III, 6. [Yüzt bei Diedenhofen, October 844], pp. 27–35; *MGH Cap.* II, 227. [Thionville, October 844], pp. 112–16; *MGH Conc.* III, 7. [Ver, December 844], pp. 36–44; *MGH Conc.* III, 9. [Beauvais, April 845], pp. 47–55; *MGH Conc.* III, 11. [Meaux-Paris, June 845 and February 846], pp. 61–132; and *MGH Conc.* III, 12. [Francia, October 846], pp. 133–9.

offered a new, clear message of what was expected of every believer: true humility for one's utter sinfulness, and belief in and confession of the absolute need for grace. Gottschalk's message grew as much out of the penitential culture of the 820s and 830s, when even Louis the Pious performed public penance for his sins,²¹ as it did out of Gottschalk's reading of Augustine. In particular the new monastic emphasis on frequent, daily prayer and confession played a central role in Gottschalk's calls for repentance.²² Rather than momentary expressions of remorse for particular sins, however, Gottschalk saw penitence as a permanent mode of Christian existence: absolute repentance and humility were meant to frame one's every action so as to avoid sin and avert God's wrath. Such a mode of existence was the very enacting of grace and evidence of one's election by God.

Gottschalk's missionary vision and doctrine of predestination could have developed in part out of his studies at Corbie—a key location for Carolingian thinking about missionary work (as we have seen) and Augustinian scholarship.²³ As noted earlier, he would later send predestination works to the fellow missionary monk Giselmair and the scholar Ratramnus there, the latter of whom would eventually compose a treatise on predestination with a position comparable to Gottschalk's.²⁴ Since the beginning of the Scandinavian mission in Louis the Pious' reign, Corbie was famed as a center for preparing and sending forth missionaries to northern Europe, including Giselmair.²⁵ Corbie monks may have helped to develop missionary strategies emphasizing one's submission to the Christian God as key to salvation, which proved influential on Gottschalk's teachings on predestination. Rimbert's *Vita Anskari*, written probably in the 860s, emphasizes divine inspiration and grace at key moments in Anskar's mission to Scandinavia, and Rimbert's correspondence with Ratramnus suggests continued links between Corbie and the northern mission.²⁶ In this tradition, submission to baptism and confession might be seen as signs of grace, which made faith and good works possible. With conversion as a hallmark in this process, such teaching might have helped make Christianity intelligible and even attractive to potential converts.

Gottschalk's earliest surviving theological writings from the 840s show that he understood salvation as possible only through grace, saying that God granted it freely to the elect while withholding it irreparably from the reprobate.²⁷ The deity's will and the act of giving or refusing grace were indivisible from divine omniscience, which enabled God from eternity to see into the nature of every human creature living within time in order to discern penitent sinners from impenitent ones. Accordingly, God's act of creation also involved the merciful and free giving of grace made available through Christ's sacrifice to the repentant, but denied it to the unrepentant, whom he justly damned for their sins. In order to emphasize God's

²¹ de Jong, *The Penitential State*, pp. 228–34.

²² See the discussion of penance later in this chapter.

²³ Ganz, *Corbie*, pp. 81–102, esp. pp. 98–102.

²⁴ Hincmar, *Ad reclusos*, ed. Gundlach, pp. 260–2; and Hincmar, *Liber*, PL 125: 84–5.

²⁵ Palmer, "Rimbert's," pp. 235–56.

²⁶ Wood, *The Missionary Life*, pp. 123–32; and Palmer, "Rimbert's," pp. 235–56.

²⁷ Gottschalk, *Fragmenta* 12–26, *CEG*, pp. 37–44; and Chazelle, *The Crucified God*, pp. 173–7.

ability to separate the elect from the reprobate, Gottschalk stressed that even the baptized reprobate were ordained to eternal torment, since baptism only removed past sins and not future ones.²⁸ Overall Gottschalk's teachings on grace articulated a novel kind of cosmic holism in terms of the mysteries of divine omnipotence and immutability on the one hand and of human sinfulness and salvation on the other.

As a missionary and reformer Gottschalk demanded that his listeners accept his message wholeheartedly and correct their lives accordingly. Indeed, his repeated use of written *confessiones* in the controversy of the 840s reveals his insistence that the faithful believe and confess twin predestination as a fundamental creed.²⁹ For Gottschalk, believing and confessing in the need for divine grace was an expression of humility with the acceptance of humanity's utter sinfulness, but it was also an essential declaration of loyalty to the reality of God's fixed ordination of salvific grace—a declaration without which election was impossible. When Gottschalk administered baptism to converts, he most likely demanded that they profess their belief in omnipotent grace in addition to the creed as was usual Carolingian practice.³⁰ In fact, it is in Gottschalk's view of his doctrine as creed that we see his methods as an assimilator of authorities in the service of creating doctrine: he drew his understanding of grace as God's freely-given gift to the elect foremost from Augustine,³¹ but also from other authors such as Fulgentius (whose works offered concise interpretations of the former author's ideas),³² and then Gottschalk formulated these earlier teachings under the Isidorean term "twin predestination" (*praedestinatio gemina*) into a very specific articulation of faith that must be believed and confessed.³³

Gottschalk's methods for bringing his audience to accept his doctrine were based on potent, logical arguments meant to force his listeners into submission. Gottschalk not only taught potential converts and the laity, but also aggressively and ruthlessly disputed with clerics and bishops, demanding—despite the fact that he was a mere priest—that they preach twin predestination in their churches.³⁴ Later in response to his condemnation in 848, he would claim that he embraced scandal for the sake of truth,³⁵ seeking to refute opponents, awaken the elect, and

²⁸ Gottschalk, *Fragmenta* 23–4, *CEG*, pp. 42–3.

²⁹ Gottschalk, *Fragmentum* 15, *CEG*, p. 38; id., *Confessio brevior*, *CEG*, pp. 52–4; and id., *Confessio prolixior*, *CEG*, pp. 55–78.

³⁰ Ganz, "Theology," p. 760; Julia Smith, "Religion and Lay Society," in *NCMH*, pp. 654–80, here pp. 656–60; Keefe, *Water and the Word*, vol. 1, pp. 2–6; and Phelan, *The Formation*, pp. 122–6, 148–61, 167–70, 185–7, and 242–7.

³¹ On Augustine and grace, see John Rist, "Augustine on Free Will and Predestination," *Journal of Theological Studies* 20 (1969), pp. 420–7; Stephen Duffy, *The Dynamics of Grace: Perspectives in Theological Anthropology* (Collegeville, MN: 1993), esp. pp. 75–119; and James Patout Burns, "Grace," in *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Allan Fitzgerald et al. (Grand Rapids, MI: 1999), pp. 391–8.

³² On Fulgentius, see Hans-Joachim Diesner, *Fulgentius von Ruspe als Theologe und Kirchenpolitiker* (Stuttgart, 1966) and Thomas Smith, "Fulgentius of Ruspe," in *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Allan Fitzgerald et al. (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 373–4.

³³ See, for example, Gottschalk, *Confessio brevior*, *CEG*, pp. 52–4, and Isidore of Seville, *Sententiae*, II, 6, 1, ed. P. Cazier, *CCSL* 111 (Turnhout, 1998), p. 103.

³⁴ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 22, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 428–9; and Amolo, *Epistola* 2, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 368–78, here p. 370.

³⁵ Gottschalk, *Confessio prolixior*, *CEG*, pp. 68–9.

divide them from the reprobate. In other words, for Gottschalk scandal, controversy, confrontation, and debate were the methods for spreading his message. The evidence suggests that Gottschalk bewildered his opponents with a vast memory for biblical and patristic texts that he apparently “could recite all day long without taking a breath,”³⁶ and which he interpreted with devastating displays of logic. The result of Gottschalk’s methods was that twin predestination was to be seen as self-evident Christian truth revealed in scripture and taught by patristic tradition.

Toward this end Gottschalk used three-part syllogisms, which began with a biblical passage as a main proposition and then included either additional scripture, passages of patristic authorities, or his own statements to complete the other two propositions of the argument.³⁷ Gottschalk claimed the three-part syllogism was a “statement . . . both learnedly and unavoidably ensnaring” (*sententia . . . satisque prudenter et inevitabiliter captiosa*) that was very difficult for his opponents to resist.³⁸ These syllogisms, therefore, were Gottschalk’s primary means of arranging and assimilating authoritative texts in his own arguments so that they agreed “naturally” with his concept.

Gottschalk first discovered how to use the syllogism from reading Paul’s Letter to the Galatians, and then developed his own technique of building a syllogism out of a single biblical proposition from reading Jerome and Augustine who, Gottschalk claimed, had created similar arguments from scripture.³⁹ As an example, Gottschalk cited Jerome’s interpretation of Paul’s Epistle to the Galatians, where the church father completed the apostle’s text with a syllogism (*sylogismus*): “‘If there is justice through the law, then Christ died for nothing’ [Gal 2:21]. Yet Christ did not die for nothing. Therefore, there is no justice through the law.”⁴⁰ Following such examples, Gottschalk modeled his own syllogisms: “‘And they will walk, who were freed and redeemed by the lord, and they will be converted and will come into Sion with praise and eternal happiness’ [Is 35:9–10]. Yet the reprobate will not come into Sion with praise and eternal happiness. Therefore they were neither freed nor redeemed by the lord.”⁴¹ In this case, Gottschalk stressed how the reprobate by their very nature were not included among the blessed described by the Prophet Isaiah, since Christ’s act of redemption did not apply to them.

That Gottschalk regarded Paul as his chief model for disputations, suggests that Gottschalk saw parallels between himself and the apostle who had also been a missionary but never a bishop. As a result of Gottschalk’s use of syllogisms in debates and his tendency to barrage opponents mercilessly with questions, his

³⁶ Hincmar, *Epistola* 169, *MGH Epp.* VIII, p. 162: “per totum diem sine respiratione aliqua praevallet memoriter decantare.”

³⁷ Gottschalk, *De trina deitate*, *CEG*, pp. 85–6; id., *Responsa de diversis*, *CEG*, pp. 155–8; and id., *De praedestinatione*, *CEG*, pp. 206–7. On Gottschalk’s use of syllogisms, see Jolivet, *Godescalc*, pp. 94–8 and 170.

³⁸ Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, *CEG*, p. 206.

³⁹ Gottschalk, *Responsa de diversis*, *CEG*, pp. 155–6.

⁴⁰ Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, *CEG*, pp. 206–7; and Jerome, *Commentarii in epistolam Pauli Apostoli ad Galatas*, I, 2, 21, ed. Giacomo Raspanti, *CCSL* 77A (Turnhout, 2006), pp. 64–5. Gottschalk’s text abbreviates Jerome’s, but the latter describes the argument specifically as a syllogism.

⁴¹ Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, *CEG*, p. 207.

adversaries often seem to have found themselves unable to offer compelling counter-arguments and finally “willing or not” (*volens nolens*) they were either forced to agree with him or to fall into a humiliating silence.⁴² Gottschalk’s assertive methods were certainly in line with missionary strategies, by which pagan beliefs were to be subverted and shown to be inferior to Christian ones,⁴³ but his techniques went far beyond the priest’s basic duty of instructing the laity in the rudiments of the faith according to the canons.⁴⁴ Ultimately it seems that Gottschalk saw himself as a universal voice of reform taking monastic readings of Augustine’s teachings on grace out into the wider world, and he probably understood his missionary work and his acquaintance with Eberhard to be the stepping stone toward a leading role in the imperial church hierarchy.

Gottschalk’s precise and startling articulation of grace’s role in salvation was something new for the Frankish world. Carolingian theologians and rulers had traditionally emphasized the need for the correct faith, divine grace, the sacraments, and good works as a complete apparatus of salvation that highlighted the potential for salvation among all Christians.⁴⁵ The Synod of Frankfurt (794) during Charlemagne’s reign in the *Opus Caroli regis* confirmed as doctrine that human rational “free choice” (*liberum arbitrium*), or the power to sin or not to sin, was present in every baptized Christian, who must then work toward their own salvation by doing penance for their post-baptismal sins.⁴⁶ While the influence of the synod on subsequent Carolingian thought is unclear, the Frankish church nonetheless viewed baptism as an individual’s release from Satan’s dominion in exchange for allegiance to Christ, after which continued faith and good works were made possible by grace.⁴⁷ This intersection of grace, faith, and good works seems to have been linked to a Frankish sense of their own special status as the *populus Dei* in an *imperium Christianum*.⁴⁸

Gottschalk’s doctrine, however, ruthlessly confirmed this configuration of grace, faith, and works only for a body of the elect that was not linked with any political or ethnic body, calling into question fundamental Carolingian assumptions about the imperial church’s ability to offer salvation to all. Such a theological message was

⁴² Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, CEG, pp. 229–31, where he discussed these tactics with a correspondent. This strategy is examined in Chapter 6.

⁴³ Lutz von Padberg, *Mission und Christianisierung: Formen und Folgen bei Angelsachsen und Franken im 7. und 8. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1995), pp. 125–40 and 299–315; and John-Henry Clay, *In the Shadow of Death: Saint Boniface and the Conversion of Hesse, 721–54* (Turnhout, 2010), pp. 376–80.

⁴⁴ Carine van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord: Priests and Episcopal Statutes in the Carolingian Period* (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 82–91 and 107–23.

⁴⁵ Epperlein, *Herrschaft*, pp. 178–85 and 201–10; and McKitterick, *Frankish Church*, pp. 1–114 for an overview of the sources; Ganz, “Theology,” pp. 758–62; and de Jong, “Charlemagne’s Church,” pp. 103–35.

⁴⁶ *Opus Caroli regis contra synodum (Libri Carolini)*, III, 1, ed. Ann Freeman, *MGH Conc. II, Supplementum I* (Hanover, 1998), pp. 339 and 340.

⁴⁷ Keefe, *Water and the Word*, vol. 1, pp. 2–6; and Phelan, *The Formation*, pp. 122–6, 148–61, 167–70, 185–7, and 242–7.

⁴⁸ Phelan, *The Formation*, pp. 1–2, 48–9 and passim; and Garrison, “The Franks as the New Israel?” pp. 114–61, who cites the older scholarship on p. 114.

clearly a form of politics on a cosmic scale, since his answer to the key question “Whom does the deity favor?” sharply contradicted the general beliefs on which the empire had been built. While in particular instances some eighth- and early ninth-century theologians were inclined to emphasize grace foremost, prior to Gottschalk’s teaching no debates emerged wherein theologians explored the mysterious interrelationship of faith, grace, and works.⁴⁹ Indeed during the anxious reform councils of 829, the Synod of Paris warned that profession of Christian faith alone without good, heavenly works to replace earthly vanities was not enough for salvation. The bishops emphasized genuine participation in Christian life with the help of grace (*Christi adiuuvante gratia*) as they called for reform among the faithful.⁵⁰ Yet this conclusion left unanswered questions about precisely how one might understand the relationship between grace and daily Christian practice.

Gottschalk’s reforms were meant to address this very concern. His surviving hymns express penitential and mournful pleas for God’s grace as the only means of avoiding just damnation for one’s sinfulness, suggesting that he saw such humble prayers as the proper devotional mode for God’s elect.⁵¹ For Gottschalk, as Augustine before him, prayers of the elect were a sign of grace,⁵² and Gottschalk expressed this in his hymns: *Christe mearum*, *Spes mea Christe*, *Christe rex regum*, *O veneranda dei suboles*, and *O deus miseri*.⁵³ These hymns articulated a piety developed from common monastic and liturgical themes in that the singers praised Christ, bemoaned their sinfulness, and offered mournful and yet hopeful pleas for forgiveness.⁵⁴

It is not surprising that Gottschalk should have adopted such penitential images in his hymns, since penance was the central theme of Christian devotion in the 820s and 830s. This culture of penance framed individual and collective experiences on many levels.⁵⁵ At reform assemblies and councils Carolingian rulers—beginning in Charlemagne’s reign and continuing during Louis’—bishops, and the

⁴⁹ Francis X. Gumerlock, “Predestination in the Century before Gottschalk, Part 1,” and “Predestination in the Century before Gottschalk, Part 2,” *Evangelical Quarterly* 81 (2009), pp. 195–209 and 319–37.

⁵⁰ *MGH Conc.* II, 2, No. 50D [Paris, 829], II, 7, pp. 656–59.

⁵¹ See, for example, Gottschalk, *Christe, mearum*, *PLAC* III, pp. 724–5.

⁵² On Augustine’s view of grace and prayer, see Monique Vincent, *Saint Augustin, maître de prière: d’après les enarrations in psalmos* (Paris, 1990), esp. pp. 261–98; and Michael Fiedrowicz, *Psalmus Vox Totius Christi. Studien auf Augustins “Enarrationes in Psalmos”* (Freiburg, 1997), esp. pp. 165–74.

⁵³ Gottschalk, *Christe, mearum*, verses 1 and 3, *PLAC* III, p. 724; id., *Spes mea, Christe*, verses 5–6, *PLAC* III, p. 726; id., *Christe, rex regum*, verses 2–6, *PLAC* III, p. 727; and id., *O veneranda dei suboles*, verse 4, *PLAC* III, p. 728; and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 135–6, 138–40, and 142.

⁵⁴ Herding, “Dichtungen,” pp. 56–7 and 64–5; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 31–4; and von Moos, “Gottschalks I,” pp. 201–30. See also my analysis of *Christe, rex regum* in this chapter.

⁵⁵ Cyrille Vogel, *Le Pêcheur et la pénitence au Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1969); Allen Frantzen, “The Significance of the Frankish Penitentials,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 30 (1979), pp. 409–21; Raymond Kottje, “Busspraxis und Bussritus,” in *Segni e riti nella chiesa altomedievale occidentale*, *Settimane* 33 (1987), pp. 369–95; Alexander Murray, “Confession before 1215,” *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, ser. vi, 3 (1993), pp. 51–81; Sarah Hamilton, *The Practice of Penance, 900–1050* (Woodbridge, UK, 2001); Abigail Firey, “Blushing Before the Judge and Physician: Moral Arbitration in the Carolingian Empire,” in *A New History of Penance*, ed. ead. (Leiden, 2008), pp. 173–200; and ead., *A Contrite Heart*, passim but esp. pp. 61–110 and 159–208. See also the discussions of penance in the Introduction, and earlier in this chapter.

imperial elite legislated on the need for penance and about what types of punishments should be given for different offenses.⁵⁶ Disputed issues were the use of penitentials with their tariff-styled punishments and episcopal control of the administration of penance.⁵⁷ Bishops encouraged the regular confession of sins and performance of penance as a vital part of pastoral care.⁵⁸ In monasteries abbots and priests emphasized the importance of confessing sins regularly and performing penance, adding this new dimension to the cloistered life.⁵⁹ In daily life in the empire, penance was the means of reconciling the sinful with the community in ecclesiastical rites,⁶⁰ in which the bishop or priest, the congregation and the sinner each played important roles in the ceremony. The bishop or priest acted as an intermediary between the penitent and God, and the congregation prayed for the restoration of the sinner to the group, while the penitent begged for forgiveness, demonstrating repentance through weeping and confessing his or her sins.⁶¹

Yet repentance as a mentality also grew out of early ninth-century monastic penitential devotion.⁶² Partly under Irish and Anglo-Saxon influence, continental monasticism began to adopt regular confession and penance as part of its culture.⁶³ A central aspect of this development was the Benedictine tradition of performing the liturgy, individual prayer, and the singing of hymns, as outlined in the *Regula*.⁶⁴ In the late eighth and early ninth centuries, perhaps under Alcuin's direction, Carolingian monastic piety took on a particularly penitential character centered on the seven penitential psalms, as monks regularly sang these psalms and other hymns, wept for their sins, confessed them to God and sought

⁵⁶ *MGH Conc.* II, 1, No. 21 [Friuli, 796/797], 8–13, pp. 177–95, here 191–4; *MGH Conc.* II, 1, No. 35 [Rheims, 813], 12, 16, and 36, pp. 253–8, here 255 and 257; *MGH Conc.* II, 1, No. 36 [Mainz, 813], 53, pp. 258–73, here 272; *MGH Conc.* II, No. 37 [Chalon-sur-Saône, 813], 18, 25, 31, 33–5, and 45, pp. 273–85, here 277–81 and 283; *MGH Conc.* II, 1, No. 38 [Tours, 813], 12, pp. 286–93, here 289; *MGH Conc.* II, [Appendices ad concilia anni 813], 8, 27, 41, and 99, pp. 294–306, here 295, 300, 303, and 306; *MGH Conc.* II, 1, No. 39 [Aachen, 816], 114, 134, and 26, pp. 307–464, here 397, 411–12, and 450–1; and *MGH Conc.* II, 2, No. 50D [Paris, 829], pp. 596–680, here 607–9, 612, 616, 640, 648–9, 663, 667, and 669. On these synods, see Hartmann, *Synoden*, pp. 117–19, 128–40, 155–60, and 179–89.

⁵⁷ See, for example, *MGH Conc.* II, 2, No. 50D [Paris, 829], p. 633.

⁵⁸ John Michael Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 258–92; McKitterick, *Frankish Church*, pp. 1–79; and Firey, *A Contrite Heart*, pp. 159–208.

⁵⁹ Hamilton, *Practice*, pp. 81–8.

⁶⁰ Previous scholarly distinctions between so-called public and private penance have not survived recent scrutiny. The nature of “secret” or “private” penance, however, and the predominance of normative sources make the gauging of this development difficult. See de Jong, “What was Public,” pp. 863–902; Rob Meens, “The Frequency and Nature of Early Medieval Penance,” in *Handling Sin: Confession in the Middle Ages*, ed. A.J. Minnis and Peter Biller (Woodbridge, 1998), pp. 34–55; Firey, “Blushing Before the Judge,” pp. 173–200; and ead. *A Contrite Heart*, pp. 9–110.

⁶¹ For examples of this rite, see: *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, 209 and *Supplementum Anianense*, 97 and 98, ed. Deshusses, pp. 338 and 451–3; and *Liber Sacramentorum Gellonensis*, 102, 592a–592b, and 596a, ed. Dumas, pp. 76–8; and on the former see Chazelle, *Crucified*, pp. 28–9.

⁶² Driscoll, “Penance,” pp. 121–63; Leclercq et al., *Spirituality*, pp. 68–94; and Vauchez, *Spirituality*, pp. 11–33.

⁶³ Meens, *Penance*, pp. 100–23 and 130–9; and James Dallen, “The Absence of a Ritual of Reconciliation in Celtic Penance,” in *The Journey of Western Spirituality*, ed. A.W. Sadler (Chico, CA: 1981), pp. 79–106.

⁶⁴ *La Règle*, 8–20, ed. de Vogüé et Neufville, pp. 508–38.

forgiveness.⁶⁵ Alcuin's influence was greatest at Tours and among his monastic *discipuli*, such as Hrabanus. Carolingian prayer books (*libelli precum*) originating in centers like Tours contained numerous *orationes* and *confessiones* in which individuals and groups were to weep and lament over their sinfulness, never reciting specific sins that they committed but sometimes listing general kinds of sins (avarice, pride, lust, etc. . . .) of which they were guilty.⁶⁶

Alcuin's tradition of penitential devotion was most likely in practice at Fulda, where Gottschalk would have learned it under Hrabanus' guidance.⁶⁷ Hrabanus described the importance of the penitential stance in his *De institutione clericorum*, urging his monks to pray frequently, shed tears, lament for their sins, and confess their sins to God.⁶⁸ He wrote that private prayer was commanded by Christ in the Gospel, and should be conducted alone, with an intent heart and tears.⁶⁹ According to Hrabanus, monks were to ask for Christ's aid before they undertook any action, and prayer—alongside confession of sins and penance—was a way of asking forgiveness for sins.⁷⁰

Gottschalk's hymns echoed common devotional and liturgical themes, making them fit neatly within the monastic culture around Rheims, but also into the developing spiritual traditions throughout the empire. Each of his hymns generally survive only in one or two manuscripts (including a few instances when he is named as poet), which does not suggest—any more than most Carolingian poetry—that his verses were meant to be preserved for wide dissemination for prosperity.⁷¹ Yet for our purposes here, one could argue that Gottschalk's hymns transform his doctrine into practice, and demonstrate how his theology, rather than a troubling message for disheartening the faithful, could be interpreted as a hopeful message for the possibility of salvation. His hymn *Christe rex regum* demonstrates just this by inserting the speaker directly into the Christian narrative of spiritual rescue and salvation from the Gospels with its pleas for grace:

1. Christ, king of kings, ruling forever, eternal light and word of the father, you who rule the whole world in mercy, patron of the needy,
2. Have mercy on your so very tearful servant, restoring your pupil corrupted in mind, may you remember him, long ago restored and ransomed.
3. Give me a favorable sign, pious king, and indeed I ask that you make me—who am unworthy—worthy, so that I may sing for you, Christ, a meter of praises now and forever.

⁶⁵ Driscoll, "Penance," pp. 133–50; id., *Alcuin*, pp. 99–142; Bullough, "Alcuin and the Kingdom," pp. 161–240; Black, "Alcuin's *Confessio*," pp. 1–56, id., "Alcuin and the Preface," pp. 1–60; and Firey, "Blushing Before the Judge," pp. 177–80.

⁶⁶ *Precum libelli quattuor aevi karolini*, ed. André Wilmart (Rome, 1940).

⁶⁷ Leclercq et al., *Spirituality*, pp. 84–90.

⁶⁸ Hrabanus, *De institutione clericorum*, II, 10–12, ed. and trans. Detlev Zimpel, 2 vols. (Turnhout, 2006), II, pp. 262–8.

⁶⁹ Hrabanus, *De institutione*, II, 11, ed. Zimpel, II, pp. 264.

⁷⁰ Hrabanus, *De institutione*, II, 10, 12, and 29, ed. Zimpel, II, pp. 262–4, 266–8, and 308–14.

⁷¹ Weber, *Die Gedichte*, pp. 81–118 discusses in detail the survival of Gottschalk's verse. On the limited transmission of Carolingian verse, see Garrison, "The Emergence of Carolingian," pp. 112–14.

4. I pray that you may make right my very life, nourishing one, [for it is] overwhelmed with offense, well-worn with faults, so that I may now render worthy obedience to you, God.
5. Extend, I ask, O Holy One, your heavenly right hand and banish this revolting and spotted leprosy, expel now my corruption, expiate my most noxious guilt.
6. Purify your servant by restoring his form, hold out sooner your salvation, worthy of thanks, lest I should fall into foul Gehenna, filled with the demon.
7. Surely long ago, God, you came into this world to restore all people, to bring peace and perennial light to all peoples.
8. And you, nourishing God, assumed mortal flesh and were made human, you willingly poured forth then your sweet and saving blood.
9. And through this death by binding death you, the restorer, freed the whole world, carrying back vessels to the heavenly fortress, shining with its king.
10. You, pastor and equally teacher, did such things, eternal helper and continuous protector, leader, sower and redeemer and author of light.
11. May you be a patron for me, may you be a foster father for me, be my protector and perpetually my guide, be my defender, O destroyer of death, and always my avenger.
12. Be my savior and at the same time my guide, may you be my helmsman just as you are my creator, may you be my conqueror, or my victor, the one who overcomes. Amen.⁷²

The imagery of Christ as the king of kings, extending his hand, healing sinners from the horror of their own evil and correcting their lives derives from the penitential psalms, penitential rites, and the *libelli precum*.⁷³ Scholars of the liturgy

⁷² Gottschalk, *Christe rex regum*, PLAC III, pp. 727–8, and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 139–41: “[1] Criste, rex regum dominans in aevum,/ lumen aeternum, patris atque verbum,/ qui regis cunctum pietate mundum,/ factor egentum./ [2] Flebilem multum miserere servum,/ mente corruptum recreans alumnum/ sis memor dudum tibi recreatum/ atque redemptum./ [3] Fac mihi signum, pie rex, benignum,/ quin et indignum, rogo, redde dignum,/ ut canam laudum tibi, Christe, metrum/ nunc et in aevum./ [4] Corrigan ipsam, precor, alme, vitam/ fraude devictam vitiisque tritam,/ ut tibi dignam deus obsequelam/ iam modo solvam./ [5] Tende praecelsam, peto, sancte, dextram/ et fuga foedam variam lepram,/ pelle iam noxam, nimium nocivam/ delue culpam. [6] Expia vernam reparando formam,/ exhibe gratam citius medelam,/ forte ne tetram ruar in gehennam/ daemone plenam./ [7] Nempe tu pridem, deus, hunc in orbem/ veneras omnem recreare plebem,/ omnibus pacem populisque lucem/ ferre perennem./ [8] Tuque mortalem deus, alme, carnem/ sumpseras idem, homo factus autem/ fuderis dulcem simul et salubrem/ sponte cruorem./ [9] Hancque per mortem religando mortem/ liberas omnem reparato orbem,/ vasa caelestem revehens ad arcem/ rege nitentem./ [10] Tanta tu, pastor pariter doctor,/ perpes adiutor, iugis atque tutor,/ feceras, ductor, sator et redemptor,/ lucis et auctor./ [11] Sis mihi factor, mihi sis et altor/ esto protector iugiterque rector,/ esto defensor, necis o peremptor/ semper et ultor./ [12] Esto salvator, simul et ducator,/ sis gubernator, velut es creator,/ sis triumphator mihi sive victor/ et superator./ Amen.” For commentary see Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 210–14; and Herding, “Dichtungen,” pp. 62–3.

⁷³ The penitential psalms are Ps 6, 32, 38, 51, 102, and 130 (by Septuagint reckoning); they are the original source for such language. Examples of Christ as *dominus* in the liturgy are ubiquitous; see the *ordo missae* in *Le sacramentaire Grégorien*, 1, ed. Deshusses, pp. 86–92; *Gellonensis*, ed. Dumas, pp. 1,

have shown how asking for divine help was an important aspect of Christian life in the ninth century—it was the right and expectation of the humble and faithful servants of God based on biblical precedent.⁷⁴ As Celia Chazelle has demonstrated, the Carolingian world as a whole understood Christ as king, savior, and lord, a concept developed from Augustine's thought in particular.⁷⁵ Christ was for Gottschalk—as for his contemporaries—a king, lord, and savior to be viewed with awe, gratitude, and love; he was an awe-inspiring (*tremendus*) figure to be revered, dreaded, and loved (*venerandus*, *metuendus*, and *amandus*).⁷⁶

Yet Gottschalk's hymn also demonstrates some unique characteristics related to his doctrine of twin predestination, suggesting how his teachings offered believers a compelling and uplifting message in the uneasy years of the 830s and 840s. The singer asks "give me a favorable sign . . . make me worthy . . . so that I may sing for you, Christ, a meter of praises now and forever," transforming his hymn and prayer into an indication (*signum*) that grace had been granted. In fact, the repeated requests and demands that salvation be extended give a sense that the purification from the horrifying leprosy of sin and the rescue from foul, demonic Gehenna *have* happened. Salvation becomes in Gottschalk's hymn what J.L. Austin called a performative "speech act," so that through the act of singing the hymn the singer enacts redemption through grace as a spiritual and affective experience.⁷⁷

Indeed, Gottschalk's retelling in stanzas seven through ten of the heroic deeds of Christ's victory over death, his rescue of the elect, and their return to the heavenly citadel with its shining king seem to place the speaker within that hopeful narrative of Christian salvation. The hymn transforms the impossibility of the unworthy sinner gaining divine grace into the wonderful possibility of the deity granting it. By the song's end, the humble singer seems destined to be fully rescued from their own evil and ultimately safe within the celestial fortress, having been led far away from Hell's diabolical torments.

Since Gottschalk's teaching was central to the missionary work he would carry out with Eberhard's support, it is worth considering how it might have appealed to the marcher lord. One of Hrabanus' letters from the 840s portrays Eberhard as a

2, 3, 4, 6. For other examples of Christ as *rex* or as one who reigns (*regnare*), see *Gellonensis*, ed. Dumas, pp. 71, 111, 145, 226, 303–4, 330, 337, 351, 364, 408, 455, and 485. See also Chazelle, *Crucified God*, pp. 75–99.

⁷⁴ Hen, *The Royal Patronage of Liturgy*, pp. 89–95; Bullough, "The Carolingian Liturgical Experience," pp. 29–64; id., "Alcuin and the Kingdom of Heaven," pp. 161–240; and Hen, *Culture and Religion*, pp. 43–60.

⁷⁵ For example, see Chazelle, *The Crucified God*, pp. 14–37. On Augustine, see Basil Studer, "Deus, Pater et Dominus bei Augustinus von Hippo," in *Essays in Tribute to G.C. Stead*, ed. Lionel Wickham and Caroline Bammel (Leiden, 1993), pp. 190–212; Goulven Madec, *Le Dieu d'Augustin* (Paris, 1998); and O'Donnell, *Augustine* pp. 7 and 289–94 on Augustine's view of Christ and God as the fear-inspiring *dominus*.

⁷⁶ Gottschalk, *Christe, mearum*, st. 6–7 and 11, *PLAC* III, p. 725 and id., *Spes mea, Christe*, st. 1 and 4, *PLAC* III, pp. 725–6; and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 136–8.

⁷⁷ John Langshaw Austin, *How to Do Things with Words*, ed. J. Urmson and M. Sbisà, 2nd ed. (Harvard, 1975).

powerful martial figure concerned with theology, seeking Hrabanus' work on the cross, hosting priests, and welcoming Gottschalk as a fixture of his household.⁷⁸ Eberhard and Gottschalk both shared an interest in Augustine's work, with Eberhard owning a copy of the church father's *Enchiridion*, a text designed to offer a clear explanation of doctrine for a layman, including a position on predestination that was close to Gottschalk's.⁷⁹ Like the duke, Gottschalk was of noble background, and probably understood the concerns of a military man about salvation.⁸⁰ Gottschalk's decision not to recant his position on predestination at his heresy trials later in the 840s as well as his determination to hold his position for twenty years in prison, indicate that he understood election to be performative.⁸¹ To deny predestination was to deny grace.⁸²

For Gottschalk to be among the elect was to struggle and suffer in life. His hymns and writings reveal that he associated his devotion to God with suffering and confessions of faith; Gottschalk sought grace, confessed his sins and his faith, and prayed for salvation in a way that seemed to make it real. Eberhard, whose interest in Hrabanus' portrayal of Christ's sacrifice on the cross demonstrates his concern with suffering, may have understood the misery and torments he underwent as a soldier as fundamental to his salvation and election.⁸³ Indeed, the 840s saw horrific violence and suffering on a massive scale in the Carolingian world, as the previous discussion of the poetry of the Frankish civil war in the 840s indicated. In this troubled time, Gottschalk understood suffering simultaneously as punishment for sinfulness and an inherent part of his role as God's faithful servant, and yet he was able to show Eberhard, who had personally taken part in the fighting, that such suffering—combined with proper humility and confession of divine truths—transformed unworthy sinners into worthy voices praising the deity and ultimately placed them in heaven.

⁷⁸ Kershaw, "Arts of War," pp. 91–3.

⁷⁹ Augustine, *Enchiridion ad Laurentium de fide et spe et caritate*, 26, 100, ed. Ernest Evans, *CCSL* 46 (Turnhout, 1988), p. 103. Evidence for Eberhard's possession of the *Enchiridion* is found in his will, which is edited in Percy Schramm and Florentine Mutherich, *Denkmale der deutschen Könige und Kaiser* I, 2nd ed. (Munich, 1981), pp. 93–4, and the book list is also printed in Gustav Heinrich Becker, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui* (Bonn, 1895), no. 12, pp. 29–30. See also Pierre Riché, "Les bibliothèques de trois aristocrates laïcs carolingiens," *Le Moyen Âge* 69 (1963), pp. 87–104, here 97–101; McKitterick, *Written Word*, pp. 245–8; Krahwinkler, *Friaul*, pp. 261–6; La Rocca and Provero, "The Dead," pp. 225–80; and Kershaw, "Arts of War," p. 92.

⁸⁰ Kershaw, "Arts of War," p. 93.

⁸¹ Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, pp. 74–7 and Schrimpf, "Implikationen," pp. 169–70.

⁸² Ganz, "Debate," p. 288.

⁸³ On Carolingian frontier warriors' devotion to the Cross, see Eric Goldberg, "'More Devoted to the Equipment of Battle than the Splendor of Banquets': Frontier Kingship, Martial Ritual, and Early Knighthood at the Court of Louis the German," *Viator* 30 (1999), pp. 41–78, here 56–73, and on Eberhard, see Kershaw, "Eberhard," pp. 92–3. For Alfred the Great's similar views on suffering, see Kershaw, "Power, Prayer and Illness," pp. 201–24. On the complexities and difficulties of combining a military and devotional life in the Carolingian world, see David Bachrach, "Confession in the Regnum Francorum (742–900): the Sources Revisited," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 54 (2003), pp. 3–22.

THE PREDESTINATION CONTROVERSY IN ITALY

Most travelers crossing the Alps in the ninth century did so in large groups, and Gottschalk probably entered Italy as part of Eberhard's entourage,⁸⁴ either by the western route in the vicinity of Lyons using either the Mount Cénis or Great St. Bernard pass; or the eastern route in the vicinity of Reichenau, taking any of the central passes, such as Splügen.⁸⁵ Walahfrid's poem, *Velox, Calliope*, written to Gottschalk in 848, indicates that Gottschalk "the wanderer" (*vaga*) had been to Rome where he met other "welcome exiles."⁸⁶ While this may have been a metaphor for his Italian journeys, quite likely Gottschalk also visited the city as a pilgrim and these exiles were probably fellow pilgrims who went to Rome as penitents to seek the intercession of the city's many martyrs and saints, above all the Apostles Peter and Paul, as so many other Christians.⁸⁷ Gottschalk's later writings give only fleeting memories of his time in Italy, such as how he adopted the Roman custom of saying "Blessed is God in his holy gifts and glorious in all of his works" after eating,⁸⁸ or how Latin speakers in Italy continued to employ the Latin usage "*loco est*" for "*ibi est*" as described by an anonymous ancient grammarian,⁸⁹ or how young Roman nobles were called "little long-hairs" (*comatuli*) for letting their hair grow half a foot down the back of their necks.⁹⁰

Yet other sources indicate that in Italy Gottschalk dedicated himself to preaching his doctrine and debating even bishops who opposed him. Among Gottschalk's earliest detractors was bishop-elect Noting of Verona, who while serving Louis the Pious on campaign in the Lahngau region in 840 solicited a treatise of biblical and patristic authorities from Abbot Hrabanus to use against Gottschalk's "heresy."⁹¹

⁸⁴ Michael McCormick, *The Origins of the European Economy: Communications and Commerce, AD 300–900* (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 394–402. On Carolingian Italy, see Chris Wickham, *Early Medieval Italy: Central Power and Local Society, 400–1000*, (London, 1981), pp. 47–63; Giovanni Tabacco, *The Struggle for Power in Medieval Italy: Structures of Political Rule* (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 109–43; and *Italy in the Early Middle Ages 476–1000*, ed. Christina La Rocca (Oxford, 2002).

⁸⁵ McCormick, *Origins*, p. 396 gives a map of the passes.

⁸⁶ Walahfrid, *Gotesscalcho monacho*, lines 6–8, *PLAC* II, p. 362.

⁸⁷ Good introductions to the vast scholarship on pilgrimage include: Debra Birch, *Pilgrimage to Rome in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 1998); Diana Webb, *Medieval European Pilgrimage, c.700–c.1500* (New York, 2002); and Maribel Dietz, *Wandering Monks, Virgins, and Pilgrims: Ascetic Travel in the Mediterranean World, A.D. 300–800* (University Park, PA: 2005).

⁸⁸ Gottschalk, *Opusculum secundum*, 71, *CEG*, pp. 421–96, here 446: "Benedictus deus in donis suis et sanctus in omnibus operibus suis gloriosus et ego sic libentissime dico."

⁸⁹ Gottschalk, *Opusculum primum*, 15, *CEG*, pp. 353–420, here 376. On vernacular Latin in the Carolingian era, see Roger Wright, *Late Latin and Early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France* (Liverpool, 1982); Michel Banniard, *Viva voce: communication orale et communication écrite en occident latin (IVe–IXe siècle)* (Paris, 1992); and id., "Language and communication in Carolingian Europe," in *NCMH*, pp. 695–709.

⁹⁰ Gottschalk, *Opusculum secundum*, 111, *CEG*, p. 489.

⁹¹ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 22, *MGH Epp.* V, p. 428, note 3. While his letter does not name Gottschalk, Hrabanus later confirmed he was writing against Gottschalk: Hrabanus, *Epistola* 44, *MGH Epp.* V, p. 490. See also Traube, "Carmina," p. 711; Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, p. 35; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, p. 20; Schrimpf, "Implikationen," pp. 164–74; and Warren Pezè, "Primum in Italiam, deinde in Galliam: la corrispondanza autour du passage de Gottschalk d'Orbais en Italie (835–48)," in *La corrispondenza epistolare in Italia 2: forme, stili e funzioni della scrittura epistolare nelle cancellerie italiane (secoli V–XV)*, ed. Stéphane Giovanni and Paolo Cammarosano (Trieste, 2013), pp. 145–69, here pp. 150–5.

The result was Hrabanus' *De praedestinatione*, his most substantial work on the subject where he formulated a fundamentally anti-Gottschalkean concept of grace: the question of divine predestination was superfluous to regular Christian believers, since the predestination of grace through the sacrament of baptism had already made salvation possible for them.⁹² After baptism, however, ordinary believers were to avoid sin based on their exercise of free choice (*liberum arbitrium*) and to seek forgiveness for those sins they did commit through repentance: "for no rational person can please God without correct faith and good works."⁹³ Hrabanus answered the question "Whom does the deity favor?" by emphasizing that baptism restored the potential for salvation, but the final outcome of this process would only be determined in the future: an unknown number of believers would become healed to receive salvation by the grace of God and would win perpetual reward through their correct exercise of free will. He assured Noting that his treatise contained the "healthy doctrine" (*sana doctrina*) to be believed and confessed, and preached to others.⁹⁴

Hrabanus advised Noting that the devil was the source of errors such as Gottschalk's absurd but noxious heresy, and that his heresy had been encountered and defeated by the church fathers already.⁹⁵ Hrabanus used two biblical images to cast Gottschalk as a false teacher: first, the classic Pauline image of the seemingly pious seducer and corruptor of souls "erring and sending others into error" (II Tim 3, 13), an image developed by Jerome;⁹⁶ second, the Petrine image of the "pseudoprophets" and "lying masters" introducing "sects of perdition" into the church (II Ptr 2, 1).⁹⁷ Hrabanus used Gottschalk's emphasis on the fixity of the divine ordination of grace before creation to say that Gottschalk made God the source of evil within creation, since the reprobate must necessarily commit evil that could not be remedied through repentance.⁹⁸ The result, Hrabanus claimed, was that God became an unjust judge, and a spiteful and tyrannical destroyer of his own creation.⁹⁹

Hrabanus' doctrine of predestination was developed through the assimilation of authorities. The most significant were the numerous biblical citations he collected regarding the importance of correct faith and good works, which was the abbot's central argument for overturning what he understood as Gottschalk's teachings about the fixity of salvation and damnation.¹⁰⁰ Yet Hrabanus took key supporting arguments for his doctrine from patristic sources, which he quoted at length but did not identify except as to claim that his treatise offered a succinct compilation of

On Noting see also *Regesta Imperii: Die Regesten des Regnum Italiae und der burgundischen Regna. Teil 1: Die Karolinger im Regnum Italiae 840–887* (888), ed. Herbert Zielinski (Cologne, 1991), pp. 7–8.

⁹² For the complete text, see Hrabanus, *Epistola V. Ad Notingum, cum libro de praedestinatione Dei*, PL 112: 1530–53.

⁹³ Hrabanus, *Epistola 5*, PL 112: 1533: "nec ullus ratione vigens sine fide recta et bonis operis deo placere potest."

⁹⁴ Hrabanus, *Epistola 5*, PL 112: 1553 with reference to Rom 12, 3.

⁹⁵ Hrabanus, *Epistola 5*, PL 112: 1531.

⁹⁶ Hrabanus, *Epistola 5*, PL 112: 1530; and Benoît Jeanjean, *Saint Jérôme et l'hérésie* (Paris, 1999), pp. 302–25.

⁹⁷ Hrabanus, *Epistola 5*, PL 112: 1541.

⁹⁸ Hrabanus, *Epistola 5*, PL 112: 1530.

⁹⁹ Hrabanus, *Epistola 5*, PL 112: 1540.

¹⁰⁰ Hrabanus, *Epistola 5*, PL 112: 1533–40.

patristic thought on predestination.¹⁰¹ By marshaling his authorities in this fashion, Hrabanus naturalized his understanding of predestination as being first based on scripture and therefore “timeless,” and second historical and traditional since it was based on patristic consensus.

Hrabanus’ patristic authorities were largely fifth-century, post-Augustinian interpretations of the church father’s thought that moderated Augustine’s later position that God had predestined both the saved and the damned.¹⁰² After Augustine’s death in 430, debate over grace and predestination continued for a century until the Council of Orange in 529 adopted as orthodox a mitigated view of Augustine’s teachings on predestination emphasizing God’s will to save all humanity.¹⁰³ Among these authors was Prosper of Aquitaine, who died ca. 455 and was arguably Augustine’s most influential interpreter;¹⁰⁴ Gennadius of Marseilles, who died ca. 496;¹⁰⁵ and the anonymous author of the pseudo-Augustinian *Hypomnesticon*, whom some have identified as Prosper of Aquitaine.¹⁰⁶ The only genuine Augustinian text quoted by Hrabanus was the *De arbitrio libero*, although quite likely he mistook the *Hypomnesticon* as Augustine’s.¹⁰⁷ This complex textual and interpretive tradition contributed significantly to the creation of “multiple Augustines” once the church father’s writings came to be investigated closely in the ninth century.

¹⁰¹ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 5, PL 112: 1553.

¹⁰² Good introductions to the extensive scholarship on Augustine and predestination include: John Rist, *Augustine: Ancient Thought Baptized* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 256–89; and James Wetzel, “Predestination, Pelagianism and Foreknowledge,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Augustine*, ed. Eleonore Stump and Norman Kretzmann (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 49–58.

¹⁰³ Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine 1: The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100–600)* (Chicago, 1971), pp. 318–32.

¹⁰⁴ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 5, PL 112: 1531–2, 1541–5; Prosper, *Responsiones ad capitula Gallorum*, 2, PL 51: 155–74, here 157–8; id., *Responsiones ad capitula Vincentianorum*, 2–3, 5, and 10–15, PL 51: 177–86, here 179–85. On Prosper, see Maïeul Cappuyns, “Le premier représentant de l’augustinisme médiéval, Prosper d’Aquitaine,” *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 1 (1929), pp. 309–37; Georges de Plinval, “Prosper d’Aquitaine interprète de saint Augustin,” *Revue des études augustiniennes* 1 (1958), pp. 339–55; and Alexander Hwang, *Intrepid Lover of Perfect Grace: The Life and Thought of Prosper of Aquitaine* (Washington, DC: 2009).

¹⁰⁵ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 5, PL 112: 1546–7 and Gennadius of Marseille, *Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum*, 20, ed. Cuthbert Hamilton Turner, *Journal of Theological Studies* 7 (1906), pp. 78–99, here 93. On Gennadius, see Cuthbert Hamilton Turner, “The *Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum*: Supplenda,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 8 (1907), pp. 103–14; Germain Morin, “Le *Liber Dogmatum* de Gennade de Marseille et problèmes qui s’y rattachent,” *Revue Bénédictine* 24 (1907), pp. 445–55; Charles Munier, “La profession de foi des *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* et les écrits de Gennade de Marseille,” *Studia Patristica* 3 (1961), pp. 248–61; and Alois Grillmeier, “Patristische Vorbilder früh-scholastischer Systematik. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Augustinismus,” *Studia Patristica* 6 (1962), pp. 390–408.

¹⁰⁶ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 5, PL 112: 1532 and 1547–53; *The Pseudo-Augustinian Hypomnesticon Against the Pelagians and Celestians*, VI, 1–2 and 3–8, ed. John Edward Chisolm, 2 vols. (Friburg, 1967–80), here II, pp. 191–3, and 193–208. On the author of the *Hypomnesticon* and his views on predestination, see Chisolm, *Pseudo-Augustinian Hypomnesticon*, I, pp. 41–129 and 170–8; and Hwang, *Intrepid Lover of Perfect Grace*, pp. 22–5.

¹⁰⁷ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 5, PL 112: 1546; and Augustine, *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, 4, ed. Jean Chéné and Jacques Pintard (Paris, 1962), p. 100.

Hrabanus' first key supporting argument, which he drew from Prosper, was that God willed all to be saved despite original sin and the corruption of the will.¹⁰⁸ To this end Christ's blood was shed and the sacrament of baptism instituted so that the human will could be restored and faithful believers could choose between good and evil. For God, Prosper wrote, created nature, but sin was *contra naturam* and created by the devil, and grace freed humans from unnatural sin. In this way, good works were both possible and necessary for salvation. Hrabanus developed this argument by quoting Augustine that the will (*voluntas*) corrected through divine grace can follow the divine will: the evil will that had formerly alienated humanity from the deity now fulfilled God's commandments, for "there is always a free will in us, but not always a good one."¹⁰⁹ Hrabanus then inserted Gennadius' argument that the power of free choice or the "rational will" (*rationalis voluntas*) is admonished and encouraged to follow God, and is then inspired by God so to be able to do those things necessary for salvation.¹¹⁰

The usefulness of this series of argumentation for Hrabanus was that it allowed him to render the very question of predestination as insignificant to believers. Baptism restores the will so that not only are Christians able to do what is necessary for salvation, but they are responsible for doing it. Gottschalk's absolute and immediate distinction between the elect and the reprobate as relevant to the here and now was replaced with a remote elect and reprobate—a remote elect because only the saints of the past are counted in their number, and a remote reprobate because they remain unknown until the end of time after all the faithful and unfaithful have completed their lives and been judged by the deity.

Hrabanus drew his second supporting argument from both Prosper's *Responsiones ad capitula Vincentianarum* and the *Hypomnesticon*, which drew a sharp distinction between foreknowledge (*praescientia*) and predestination, and claimed that confusing these two was an ancient heresy that twisted predestination into a perverted understanding (*pravus sensus*): while God foreknows both good and evil, he only preordains the good, and those who claim otherwise make God the author of evil human wills.¹¹¹ Predestination, understood here as God's final judgment, has not yet happened and remains uncertain to all but the omniscient and unchanging God, and to seek out why salvation is not ultimately universal is to probe into the deity's "terrifying and incomprehensible secrets" (*metuenda et incomprehensibilia secreta*).¹¹² This second line of reasoning transforms Gottschalk's doctrine about predestination into an historical error that has *already* been

¹⁰⁸ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 5, PL 112: 1532, 1541–3; and Prosper, *Responsiones ad capitula Gallorum*, 2, PL 51: 157–8; and id., *Responsiones ad capitula Vincentianarum*, 2–3 and 5, PL 51: 179–81.

¹⁰⁹ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 5, PL 112: 1546; and Augustine, *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, 4, ed. Chéné and Pintard, p. 100: "Semper est in nobis voluntas libera, sed non semper bona."

¹¹⁰ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 5, PL 112: 1546–7; and Gennadius, *Liber*, 20, ed. Turner, p. 93.

¹¹¹ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 5, PL 112: 1543–5; Prosper, *Responsiones ad capitula Vincentianarum*, 10–15, PL 51: 182–5; and *The Pseudo-Augustinian Hypomnesticon*, VI, 3–8, ed. Chisolm, II, pp. 193–208.

¹¹² Hrabanus, *Epistola* 5, PL 112: 1547; and *Hypomnesticon*, VI, 3–8, ed. Chisolm, II, pp. 193–208.

condemned and refuted. As well, Gottschalk's claims about predestination confuse foreknowledge with predestination so as to make God the source of evil, and his investigations into divine secrets are blasphemous and presumptuous.

Noting was not the only Verona cleric to seek out the aid of a learned colleague, showing that Gottschalk and his teachings were stirring up debate about grace in Italy. Vitalis, the archdeacon of Verona wrote to Pacificus, a former archdeacon of Verona at the monastery of Nonantola, to seek help against a heresy preached by "certain bishops and priests" in Verona who claimed that Adam was never rescued from Hell by Christ because he was the father of original sin—like Judas he remained there for eternal damnation.¹¹³ Pacificus forwarded the letter to Hildemar of Civate, who disparaged the inventors of "new sects" motivated by the "error of recklessness" (*error temeritatis*) and responded with scriptural and patristic authorities indicating that Adam had indeed been rescued from Hell by Christ.¹¹⁴ Neither letter mentions Gottschalk or his doctrine specifically, but the question of Adam's original sin is connected to the question of grace, and it seems most likely that Gottschalk's presence in northern Italy was spawning various theological discussions about grace and sin.

Irish scholars in Italy and neighboring lands also responded to Gottschalk's teachings. *Peregrini* associated with Milan, Reichenau, and St. Gall left behind evidence in manuscripts that they debated with Gottschalk or at least researched his teachings on predestination.¹¹⁵ There are three manuscripts—St. Gallen 48, Dresden Sächsische LB A. 145b or the "Codex Boernerianus," and Bern 363 or the "Bern Horace"—which are associated with the monastery of St. Gall in the ninth century and were connected with Irish *peregrini* interested in Gottschalk's teachings.¹¹⁶ While it has been suggested that some of the manuscripts were once

¹¹³ Augusto Campana, "Il carteggio di Vitale e Pacifico col monaco Ildemaro," *Atti del Congresso internazionale di diritto romano e di storia del diritto*, I (Milan 1953), pp. 269–80, here pp. 272–3.

¹¹⁴ Hildemar, *Epistola* 33, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 355–7; Cristina La Rocca, *Pacifico di Verona. Il passato carolingio nell'costruzione della memoria urbana* (Rome, 1995), esp. 181–2 (special thanks to Cristina La Rocca for these references); and Pezé, "Primum in Italiam," pp. 158–61.

¹¹⁵ Traube, "Carmina," p. 718; and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 23–34. On Irish scholars and *peregrini* on the Continent, see Tomas Ó Fiaich, "Irish Peregrini on the Continent," *Irish Ecclesiastical Review* 103 (1965), pp. 233–40; Charles-Edwards, "Social Background," pp. 43–59; *Die Iren und Europa im früheren Mittelalter*, ed. Heinz Löwe, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1982); Lisa Bitel, *Isle of the Saints: Monastic Settlement and Christian Community in Early Ireland* (Ithaca, 1990), pp. 222–34; and Michael Richter, "St Gallen and the Irish in the Early Middle Ages," in *Ogma: Essays in Celtic Studies in Honour of Próinséas Ní Chatháin*, ed. id. and Jean-Michel Picard (Dublin, 2002), pp. 65–75.

¹¹⁶ For facsimiles of the three manuscripts, see: Heinrich Christian Michael Rettig, *Antiquissimus Quatuor Evangeliorum Canoniorum Codex Sangallensis Graeco-Latinus Interlinearis* (Zürich, 1836); Alexander Reichardt, *Der Codex Boernerianus der Briefe des Apostles Paulus (Msc. Dresd. A. 145b) in Lichtdruck nachgebildet* (Leipzig, 1909); and Hermann Hagen, *Codex Bernensis 363, phototypic editus* (Leiden, 1897). On these manuscripts, see Gustav Scherrer, *Verzeichnis des Handschriften der Stiftsbibliothek St. Gallen* (Halle, 1875), pp. 20–1; Hagen, *Catalogus*, pp. 347–50; Franz Schnorr von Carolsfeld, *Katalog der Handschriften der königlichen Bibliothek zu Dresden* (Leipzig, 1882), p. 67; James Kenney, *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland: Ecclesiastical* (New York, 1929), pp. 553–69; Bernhard Bischoff, "Irische Schreiber im Karolingerreich," in *Colloques internationaux du C.N.R.S. No 561—Jean Scot Érigène et l'histoire de la philosophie* (Paris, 1977), pp. 47–58—reprinted in id., *Mittelalterliche Studien*, (Stuttgart, 1981), III, pp. 39–54; Johannes Duft, "Irische Handschriftsüberlieferung in St. Gallen," in *Die Iren und Europa im früherem Mittelalter*, ed. Heinz Löwe (Stuttgart, 1982), pp. 916–37, here 926–7; and

in the possession of Sedulius Scottus and John Eriugena, it seems more likely that the Irish scholars Marcus and Moengal (perhaps also known as Marcellus), or other anonymous Irishmen connected with the St. Gall school, worked with them.¹¹⁷ St. Gallen 48 and Boernerianus present the most compelling evidence: they have Greek New Testament passages (the Gospels and Paul's letters respectively) with Latin interlinear translations, and "against Gottschalk" (*contra ΓΟΔΔΙΣΚΑΛΚΟΝ*) was written in the margins next to passages dealing with predestination, presumably for use in arguing against his teachings.¹¹⁸

Yet Gottschalk may not have been without significant ecclesiastical allies south of the Alps. When Traube and Lambot published Gottschalk's incomplete verse letter to a bishop named Lupus contained along with Isidore of Seville's *Etymologies* and an antiphony in Vatican Library manuscript Vat. lat. 7803, they identified the recipient as Bishop Lupus of Châlons-sur-Marne, who held his see 838–53.¹¹⁹ Yet Bishop Lupus of Châlons was among those at the Synod of Quierzy (849) who condemned Gottschalk, suggesting that he was not the sympathetic correspondent and supporter described in the letter.¹²⁰ A more likely recipient was the obscure Italian bishop, Lupus of Chieti (*Lupus episcopus ecclesiae Teatine*), who was present at negotiations between Louis II, Drogo of Metz and Pope Sergius II in 844, but about whom little else is known.¹²¹ Chieti (known in Roman times as Teate) lies on the Pescara River and was a large city in what is today known as the Abruzzo region in central Italy on the eastern, Adriatic side of the peninsula. The eleventh- or twelfth-century manuscript containing Gottschalk's letter is written partially in Beneventan and partially in Caroline script and seems to be Italian in origins, which suggests that Lupus of Chieti was the likely recipient.¹²² This letter is especially important for revealing how Gottschalk interacted with powerful ecclesiastical

David Dumville, *Three Men in a Boat: Scribe, Language, and Culture in Viking-Age Europe* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 42–7.

¹¹⁷ Ludwig Traube, *O Roma nobilis* (Munich, 1892), pp. 346–53; Johannes Duft and Peter Meyer, *Die irischen Miniaturen der Stiftsbibliothek St. Gallen* (Bern, 1953); Duft, "Irische Handschriftsüberlieferung," pp. 926–7; Michael Herren, "St. Gall 48: A Copy of Eriugena's Glossed Greek Gospels," in *Tradition und Wertung. Festschrift für Franz Brunhölzl*, ed. G. Bernt, F. Rädle, and G. Silagi (Sigmaringen, 1989), pp. 97–105; Ganz, "Debate," p. 284; and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 26–34.

¹¹⁸ Traube, *O Roma*, pp. 350–3; and Hermann Josef Frede, *Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften* (Freiburg, 1964), pp. 50–79.

¹¹⁹ Traube, *MGH PLAC IV*, pp. 709 (incl. note 4 which extends to p. 710), 720–1 and 723–4; Lambot, pp. xxii and 49–51; and Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, p. 18. On Lupus of Châlons' dating, see Louis Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule III: les provinces du nord et de l'est* (Paris, 1915), p. 98.

¹²⁰ *MGH Conc. III*, 18 [Quierzy, Spring 849], p. 196.

¹²¹ *MGH Conc. III*, 5. [Rom, June 15, 844], pp. 24–6, which reprints the *Vita Sergii*, cc. 14–16, in *Le Liber Pontificalis*, ed. Louis Duchesne, vol. 2 (Paris, 1892), pp. 89–90, where Bishop Lupus of Chieti is listed among those present. For an introduction to this text, see *The Lives of the Ninth-Century Popes*, trans. and comm. Raymond Davis (Liverpool, 1995), pp. 71–4. The meeting between the pope, Louis, and Drogo is also recounted in *Annales Bertini*, an. 844, ed. Grat et al., pp. 45–6. See *The Annals of St-Bertin*, trans. Nelson, p. 57, notes 2–5 for further commentary.

¹²² Elias Avery Loew, *The Beneventan Script: A History of the South Italian Miniscule*, 2nd ed. prepared by Virginia Brown, 2 vols. (Rome, 1980), here vol. 2, p. 153; and Virginia Brown, "Palimpsested Texts in Beneventan Script: A Handlist with Some Identifications," in *Early Medieval Palimpsests*, ed. Georges Declercq (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 99–144, here p. 136.

superiors in Italy who were sympathetic to his teachings and could provide invaluable friendship and patronage.

Gottschalk wrote Lupus a letter consisting of 50 lines of rhyming prose, similar in style to the one written to Ebo in the early 830s.¹²³ The text was an attempt to continue an ongoing communication with Lupus, which had begun with a conversation between the two and was furthered by a letter from the bishop that Gottschalk received on July 23, according to his text.¹²⁴ Gottschalk addressed Lupus as a patron, ally, and one of the elect—eminently pious, holy, and capable of interceding for him with prayers—while representing himself as a sinner, specifically as Lazarus, dead with sin but hopeful of God's grace. The letter's opening contrasted Lupus' holiness with Gottschalk's humility, while emphasizing the latter's deep loyalty to the bishop:

To my most glorious lord and most pious father, among the vessels of mercy and honor most excellent, and most reverend in sublimity of wisdom as in sanctity of life, Lupus, most worthy of the pontifical chair by the grace of God, most benign bishop, I, Gottschalk, the least of all living under heaven, but the most faithful to your body and spirit, wish as a reward for your present life's achievement both prosperity for many years here and afterwards for deliverance of eternal glory in Christ.¹²⁵

Characterizing Lupus as a lord and spiritual father as well as one of God's elect, Gottschalk described the bishop a "vessel of mercy," which was a term from Paul's Epistle to the Romans (9, 23) used by patristic authors such as Augustine and Fulgentius and Carolingian authors alike to describe the *electi*.¹²⁶ Gottschalk himself used the term in the 850s and 860s, as did others in the predestination debate, including both authors holding similar positions such as Prudentius of Troyes, who cited examples of Augustine using the term, and opponents like Hincmar.¹²⁷ Gottschalk emphasized his certainty about Lupus' virtues and holiness, but

¹²³ Lambot, "Lettre," p. 41.

¹²⁴ Gottschalk, *Epistula*, PLAC III, p. 723, and *CEG*, pp. 49–50.

¹²⁵ Gottschalk, *Epistula*, lines 1–6, PLAC III, p. 723, and *CEG*, p. 49: "Domino gloriosissimo patrique piissimo inter vasa misericordiae ac honoris excellentissimo et tam sublimitate sapientiae quam sanctitate vitae reverentissimo Lupo gratia dei pontificali] cathedra dignissimo antistiti benignissimo Gottescalc licet infimus omnium degentium sub caelo fidissimus tamen corpori et spiritui vestro praesentis vitae ad emolumentum et [hic] longaeuam prosperitatem opto et perennis postmodum gloriae sospitatem in Christo."

¹²⁶ For examples from Augustine, see *De civitate Dei*, XV, 2, 6, and 21, and XXI, 16, 24, and 27, ed. Bernard Dumbart and Alfons Kalb, CCSL 47 (Turnhout, 1955), pp. 454–5, 458–9, 486–7, 782–3, 789–95, and 800–5. Fulgentius, *De veritate praedestinationis et gratiae*, I, 7, 21, and II, 36–7, 40–2, ed. J. Fraipont, CCSL 91A (Turnhout, 1968), pp. 461–2, 471–2, 514–15, and 518–19.

¹²⁷ Gottschalk, *Responsa de diversis*, *CEG*, pp. 150; id., *De praedestinatione*, *CEG*, p. 181 (a variant: *filiis misericordiae*) and p. 256 (quoting Augustine); and id., *De praedestinatione*, p. 343. Prudentius, *Epistola ad Hincmarum et Pardulum*, 6–7 and 13, *PL* 115: 971–1010, here 981–2, and 984–5 and 1005. On Prudentius' theology, see Ganz, "Debate," pp. 293–4; Pierre Peititmengin, "D'Augustin à Prudence de Troyes: les citations augustinienes dans un manuscrit d'auteur," in *De Tertullien aux Mozarabes, II: Antiquité tardive et Christianisme ancien (Vie–IXe siècles). Mélanges offerts à Jacques Fontaine*, ed. Louis Holtz and Jean-Claude Fredouille (Paris, 1992), pp. 229–51; and Jared Wilfaert, *Prudentius of Troyes (d. 861) and the Reception of the Patristic Tradition in the Carolingian Era* (Dissertation, Toronto, 2015), pp. 130–212. Hincmar, *Liber*, 6–7, 9, 11, and 16–17, *PL* 125: 91, 93, 99, 102, 104–5, 109, 141, 156, and 158.

expressed doubts about his own hopes for salvation. He claimed that he was counted among the bishop's *fideles*, suggesting that Bishop Lupus already supported him, although he merited only the "least place" (*extremus locus*).¹²⁸ To cement this image of himself as an obedient and loyal follower, Gottschalk also contrasted his meager talents as a correspondent with Lupus' letter, which he described as "most beautiful in wisdom, most splendid in eloquence, and what is greater than these, most fortified in humility, most distinguished in charity and therefore most dear and pleasing to me."¹²⁹

Gottschalk then explained that if Lupus favored him, he would be acting as God's agent who served as a channel for divine clemency and the "free gift of divine grace" (*gratuitum gratiae donum*). Gottschalk, in return, would be eternally grateful and full of praise for Lupus in this life and the next as the debt of charity required.¹³⁰ In this way, Gottschalk wanted Lupus to understand that in helping him the bishop would be carrying out his duty as one of God's vessels of mercy, that is as one of the elect, who were expected above all to pay the debt of brotherly love.¹³¹ According to Gottschalk, grace was the sole means of bringing one to salvation, but he allowed that the intercession of the elect could help make this happen. Gottschalk's phrase about grace, "free gift of divine grace," is one that he used in his confessional writings of the 840s and some later texts.¹³² His understanding of grace as God's freely-given gift to the elect came from Augustine, and it was also found in the writings of Fulgentius.¹³³ What is fascinating about Gottschalk's description of grace is its proximity here with his request for Lupus' intercession. While grace is all-powerful, nevertheless Lupus' prayers and merit could help bring Gottschalk God's mercy and the accompanying *gratia*. For Gottschalk, as Augustine before him, prayers of the elect were a sign of grace. Gottschalk's view of prayer appears to have been like his understanding of the sacraments—they aided the elect in receiving God's grace, and therefore Lupus' prayers were worth seeking.¹³⁴

Gottschalk continued to praise the bishop for his virtues—humility, charity, kindness, and piety—and offered himself as a client in return for the gift of his letter and for remembering their previous conversation.¹³⁵ He cast himself as Lazarus,

¹²⁸ Gottschalk, *Epistula*, PLAC III, p. 723, and *CEG*, p. 49.

¹²⁹ Gottschalk, *Epistula*, PLAC III, p. 723, and *CEG*, p. 49: "sapientia speciosissimae, eloquentia splendissimae et, quae his maiora sunt humilitate praemunitissimae, c[aritate] praecllentissimae et ideo mihi karissimae atque gratissimae."

¹³⁰ Gottschalk, *Epistula*, PLAC III, pp. 723–4, and *CEG*, pp. 49–50.

¹³¹ For a sustained examination of *caritas* in the Carolingian world, see Romig, *Be a Perfect Man*.

¹³² Gottschalk, *Fragmenta* 14 and 15, *CEG*, p. 38; id., *Confessio prolixior*, *CEG*, pp. 55 and 76; id., *De Trinitate*, *CEG*, p. 269; id., *Quibus modis dicatur redemptio*, *CEG*, p. 281; and id., *De praedestinatione*, *CEG*, p. 343.

¹³³ Gottschalk's textual borrowings from Augustine and other authors are discussed in Chapters 4, 5, and 6. See also the discussion of Augustine, grace, and Fulgentius earlier in this chapter.

¹³⁴ For Gottschalk's views of the sacraments and the elect, see Epperlein, *Herrschaft*, pp. 217–28; Pelikan, *Growth*, pp. 81–98; Schrimpf, "Implikationen," pp. 164–74; and Chazelle, *Crucified God*, pp. 177–8 and 227–38.

¹³⁵ Gottschalk, *Epistula*, PLAC III, p. 724, and *CEG*, p. 51.

dead with sin, hoping that Lupus, in turn, would play the role of Lazarus' sisters, Mary Magdalene and Martha, and intercede with Christ on his behalf:

I only wish to be wholly yours, while I live, if the Lord Jesus Christ, our redeemer, as our mediator should deem both of us to be worthy. For your part I do not doubt he would, but for mine I do more than a little; I do not—God forbid!—despair of his grace, in whom I always have trusted and do trust to be blessed, because he who carried off Lazarus to revive him, can also restore me—buried in sins—back to life. But if only I should not lack “sisters,” who are willing and able to beseech him for me. This request, my worthy lord, I ask that you deign mercifully to ask and humbly to invoke the mercy of Jesus Christ.¹³⁶

Here Gottschalk revealed most clearly how he saw the connection between grace and Lupus' support. For by accepting Gottschalk as his client and praying for him, Lupus would act as God's instrument and bring him grace. Gottschalk used the Lazarus story in John's Gospel to describe his situation, which recounted how Christ's friend Lazarus succumbed to disease and died while the savior was away, but four days later he arrived and Lazarus' sisters, Maria and Martha, mourned and prayed so piteously that they broke his spirit and compelled him to raise their brother from the dead.¹³⁷ Gottschalk wanted Lupus to see that he was Lazarus, dead with sin, who could be revived if the bishop, like Lazarus' sisters, should call on Christ to restore him to life.

The Carolingians saw Lazarus' resurrection as a symbol of hope for all Christians, as Radbertus' and Hrabanus' commentaries on the Gospel of Matthew attest.¹³⁸ Hrabanus and Radbertus also associated Lazarus' death with penance and his resurrection with Christ's forgiveness.¹³⁹ Interpreting John's Gospel, Augustine and Alcuin (who followed the church father in his examination) characterized Lazarus as a sinner, whom Christ forgave, emphasizing the moment as revelatory of divine grace.¹⁴⁰ Augustine, however, also stressed in his commentary on this Gospel and in a sermon on Matthew the confessional aspect of Lazarus' resurrection, writing that he was forgiven his sins since his emergence from the tomb was like a confession; he urged his readers to understand: “when you confess, you come

¹³⁶ Gottschalk, *Epistula*, lines 32–50, *PLAC* III, p. 724, and *ÆG*, p. 51: “Nisi quod totus esse cupio, dum vivo, vester, si tamen dominus Iesus Christus, redemptor noster, utriusque nostrum fore dignetur sequester. Nam de vestra parte nihil, de mea vero non mediocriter dubito; non tamen, quod absit, de illius gratia diffido, in quo beatus fore et semper confisus sum et confido, quia, qui Lazarum distulit, ut posset resuscitare, me quoque peccatis mersum potens est vivificare; sed utinam mihi non desint sorores, quae pro me velint et possint eidem supplicare, quod vos, domine mi, dignamini, quaeso, misericorditer flagitare et Christi Iesu clementiam suppliciter invocare.”

¹³⁷ Jo 11, 1–44.

¹³⁸ Radbertus, *Expositio*, IX, lines 2854–61 and 3499–514, ed. Paulus, pp. 1018 and 1038–9; and Hrabanus, *Expositio in Mattheum*, VI, lines 45–51, ed. Bengt Löfstedt, *CCCM* 174–174A (Turnhout, 2000), p. 552.

¹³⁹ Hrabanus, *Expositio*, III, lines 53–65, ed. Löfstedt, pp. 280–1; and Radbertus, *Expositio*, IX, lines 3405–18, ed. Paulus, p. 1035.

¹⁴⁰ Alcuin, *Commentariorum in Joannem*, PL 100: 743–1008, here 896–903; and Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus cxxiv*, XLIV, 3–5, ed. D. Radbod Willems, *CCSL* 36 (Turnhout, 1954), pp. 420–3. On Alcuin's Augustinian borrowings in another text, see Cavadini, “Sources,” pp. 123–46.

forth . . . so that sins may be forgiven” (*quando confiteris, procedis . . . ut solverentur peccata*).¹⁴¹ In a similar way, Paulinus of Aquileia wrote verses about Lazarus’ resurrection, also equating him with a sinner, punished with death, whose resurrection enabled him to confess his sins and receive Christ’s forgiveness.¹⁴² Paulinus understood Lazarus’ sisters’ prayers and tears as most important in winning Christ’s aid: “Let those sisters come, let them entreat Jesus with tears for the sake of the dead, so that he might mercifully revive the soul, which has died, on seeing their piety and let him remove the insensible hardness from his heart.”¹⁴³

Gottschalk’s characterization of himself and the bishop suggests that he drew upon these interpretations of the Lazarus story in his letter. Gottschalk later characterized himself again as a “second Lazarus” (*secundus Lazarus*)—dead, “stinking” (*fetidus*), “swarming with worms” (*scatens vermibus*) and in need of divine grace for salvation—in his poem *O mi custos*, dedicating eleven stanzas (48–58) out of 73 to this identification.¹⁴⁴ This poem was written years later during his incarceration in Hautvillers after the Synod of Quierzy in 849. While *O mi custos* would be a direct appeal to Christ, his request for prayers from Lupus shows a side of episcopal patronage and support worth emphasizing here: Gottschalk wanted the help of one of the *electi* so that he too would receive God’s grace. He combined his penitential stance with ideas about predestination to describe himself as a hopeful candidate for divine election, stressing the bishop’s status and ability to pray for Gottschalk and most likely to support him in the doctrinal debates happening in Italy.

Gottschalk’s letter to Bishop Lupus provides illuminating hints that he received support and friendship from some clerics in Italy, clerics inclined to disagree with Bishop Noting, Hildemar, and others hostile to his views of grace. The exact nature of these debates remains unclear, but clearly Gottschalk’s activities stirred up controversy in northern Italy with clerics and theologians, who were divided over the issues of grace and salvation. Whatever the contours of these disputes were, Gottschalk’s 840s legacy in Italy left its mark on the Synod of Pavia (850), arranged by King Louis II and his bishops to reform the realm, the surviving legislation of which suggests that Gottschalk and his supporters were perceived as a threat to the ecclesiastical peace.¹⁴⁵ That this ruling followed his condemnations at Mainz (848) and Quierzy (849) seems to indicate that the Italian episcopate in the time of Bishop Lupus of Chieti in the mid-840s was divided over the question of grace, and that only with the process of reform under King Louis II was consensus reached that cohered to the northern synods’ decisions.

¹⁴¹ Augustine, *In Iohannis*, XLIX, 23–4, ed. Willems, p. 431 and id., *Sermo* 67, PL 38: 433–7, here 433–4. The quotation is from the former work.

¹⁴² Paulinus of Aquileia, *Versus de Lazaro*, PLAC VI, pp. 210–19, here st. 51–60, pp. 216–18.

¹⁴³ Paulinus, *Versus*, st. 58, PLAC VI, p. 217: “Veniant istae sorores, pro salute mortui/ Iesum lacrimis exorent, ut clementer animam, Quae est mortua, respectu pietatis suscitet, Insensibilem rigorem de corde removeat.”

¹⁴⁴ Gottschalk, *O mi custos*, PLAC VI, pp. 94–5, with the reference to stinking and worms in st. 48, p. 94. See *Poetry*, trans. Godman, pp. 42–3 and 232–47 for commentary and translation. See also von Moos, “Gottschalks I,” pp. 201–30, and id., “Gottschalks II,” pp. 317–58.

¹⁴⁵ *MGH Conc.* III, No. 23 [Pavia, 850], pp. 217–29.

While the canons do not mention Gottschalk by name, they include rulings against unsupervised priests and wandering monks, whose interactions with the laity and spreading of “errors” were seen as a great threat to the church. Priests operating without the supervision of a bishop, or without having been properly examined by one and allowed to carry out their duties, were regarded as having usurped their office; they were to be warned against performing the sacraments especially in the homes of the laity and, should they fail to heed the warning, they would be excommunicated.¹⁴⁶ The bishops’ concern here was that priests like Gottschalk were misguiding secular people and even violating the sacraments—harming the purity of the faith and practice of the church.

One canon from the synod related to wandering monks spoke directly to Gottschalk’s activities as an authority on predestination:

Certain clerics and monks roaming abroad through different lands and many cities to and fro are scattering errors and disseminating useless questions, deceiving the hearts of the simple. The holy synod decreed about them that they should be detained by the bishop of the place and brought to the metropolitan to be examined by ecclesiastical discussion; and if they are found to have sown these inquietudes among the people for the sake of vanity and boasting, rather than for the benefit of teaching, let them suffer a fitting discipline as disturbers of ecclesiastical peace.¹⁴⁷

The bishops’ description of figures like Gottschalk suggests that such clerics and monks held some appeal for the laity. They clearly engaged lay people in serious discussions about doctrine, and were probably attractive to them for this reason. Gottschalk’s later conduct during the predestination debate reveals that he was confident in his knowledge of scripture and the fathers, devout, and willing to teach divine mysteries. While the bishops regarded such matters as troubling and dangerous in 850, some members of the laity, including the powerful Eberhard of Friuli, in addition to clerics such as Bishop Lupus seem to have found Gottschalk’s ideas appealing.

Before turning to Hrabanus’ correspondence with Eberhard, let us consider Gottschalk’s few remarks about his missionary period in the Balkans.¹⁴⁸ Once thought to be a remarkable travel oddity, Gottschalk has been revealed to have been simply one of many western European travelers in the Balkans during the period by Michael McCormick.¹⁴⁹ Our knowledge of Gottschalk’s interactions with Venetians, Dalmatians, Slavs, and Bulgars is derived from his own anecdotes,

¹⁴⁶ *MGH Conc.* III, No. 23 [Pavia, 850], 18, pp. 227–8. On priests and bishops, see van Rhijn, *Shepherds of the Lord*, pp. 82–95.

¹⁴⁷ *MGH Conc.* III, No. 23 [Pavia, 850], 21, pp. 228–9: “CAP. XXI. Quidam clericorum vel monachorum peregrinantes per diversas vagando provincias et civitates multiplices spargunt errores et inutiles questiones disseminant decipientes corda simplicium. De his decrevit sancta sinodus, ut ab episcopo loci detineantur et ad metropolitanum deducti discussione ecclesiastica examinentur; et si vanitatis atque iactantie, non autem utilitatis aut doctrine causa has inquietudines serere reperiuntur in populis, velut ecclesiastice pacis perturbatores congruenti disciplina macerentur.”

¹⁴⁸ On southeastern Europe in the ninth century, see John Fine, *The Early Medieval Balkans: A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century* (Ann Arbor, 1983); and Florin Curta, *Southeastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 500–1250* (Cambridge, 2006), pp. 111–79.

¹⁴⁹ McCormick, *Origins*, pp. 129–73 and 523–70.

preserved in his later writings. These passages—like Gottschalk’s letter to Lupus and Hrabanus’ to Eberhard—reveal that he mingled with leaders and their noble followings, and impressed them as a figure with prophetic and priestly powers. Gottschalk’s participation in the Christianization process outside the empire would have been an important contribution to Eberhard’s task of defending northern Italy and spreading the Gospel, making it missionary work with potentially great political significance.

As a Latin speaker Gottschalk would have had little difficulty communicating with the peoples of the Adriatic, who continued to speak dialects of Latin during this period. A grammatical anecdote of Gottschalk reveals that he met Venetians and Dalmatians, and the subject of their talks was clearly faith and politics:

All of the Venetians, who live on the sea in cities, are Latin men who call their lord that is the emperor of the Greeks, not “lord” at all, but “lordship.” For they say: “Benign lordship have mercy on us,” and, “We were before our lordship,” and, “Thus his lordship said to us.” But lest their [way] seem to you like rustic speech, see how it is in heaven. In place of “lords” those blessed spirits are called “lordships,” who are constituted sixth in order among the rest. In this way “deity” and “divinity” are used for “God”. Likewise the Dalmatian men, that is Latin men likewise no less subject to the power of the Greeks, call their king and emperor in common speech through all of Dalmatia—a very expansive region in fact—I say they call their king and emperor “kingdom” and “empire.” For they say: “We were with the kingdom,” and, “We stood before the empire,” and, “Thus the kingdom said to us,” and, “Thus the empire said to us.”¹⁵⁰

As the details of this grammatical discussion suggest, Gottschalk quite likely blended his discussions of politics among these Latin speakers with questions of theology and biblical interpretation. Whether in Friuli or among the various Latin speakers of the Adriatic, Gottschalk mingled with nobles whose concerns focused on their connections to the Byzantine emperor, and Gottschalk likely did not fail to reveal to them his doctrine of twin predestination, as Hincmar later claimed.¹⁵¹

Gottschalk surfaced in the presence of King Trpimir of the Croats, whom he possibly met through Eberhard and for whom he probably served as both a missionary and prophet or soothsayer.¹⁵² Trpimir was the first known king of the Croats, and like other Slavic rulers trying to establish his legitimacy between the Carolingian, Byzantine, Greater Moravian, and Bulgarian powers, he may have

¹⁵⁰ Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, 6, *CEG*, p. 208: “Omnes Venetici qui sunt videlicet intra mare degentes in civitatibus homines Latini dominum suum id est imperatorem Graecorum nequaquam vocant dominum sed dominationem. Dicunt enim: Benigna dominatio miserere nostri, et: Fuimus ante dominationem, et: Ita nobis dixit dominatio. Sed ne tibi vilescat illorum quasi rustica loquutio, vide quid sit in caelo. Nam pro dominis dominationes vocantur illi spiritus beati qui sunt inter ceteros in ordine constituti VI. Sic ergo dicitur deitas et divinitas pro deo. Item homines Dalmatini, perinde id est similiter homines Latini Graecorum nihilominus imperio subjecti, regem et imperatorem communi locutione per totam Dalmatiam longissimam revera regionem regem inquam et imperatorem regnum et imperium vocant. Auunt enim: Fuimus ad regnum, et: Stetimus ante imperium, et: Ita nobis dixit regnum, et: Ita nobis loquutum est imperium.”

¹⁵¹ *Annales Bertini*, s.a. 849, ed. Grat et al., pp. 56–7.

¹⁵² Curta, *Southeastern*, pp. 139–40.

looked to Gottschalk as a welcome aid and emissary from Eberhard.¹⁵³ The ninth century was the era of intense, sustained competition between missionaries from Rome, Byzantium, and the Carolingian world for new converts in the Slavic lands.¹⁵⁴ Most famous of these missionaries were Cyril and Methodius, whose activities were of especial importance in Moravia and Bulgaria, although clearly others such as Gottschalk were involved for many years in the complex process of Christianization in this part of Europe.¹⁵⁵ The Croat elite did adopt the Latin form of the faith during the middle of the ninth century—emulating their Carolingian and Italian counterparts—and Trpimir founded a monastery with an arch still bearing the inscription “PRO DUCE TREPIM” at Rižinice near the old Roman city of Salona later in 852 as part of this transformation.¹⁵⁶

Gottschalk demonstrated great care to impress Trpimir with his vast knowledge, and no doubt such an ability to counsel a secular lord must have made him an attractive figure. Gottschalk later recorded an anecdote regarding when he advised Trpimir about signs by which he might predict whether his forces would win a battle with the Greeks:

It is no wonder when even crows, kites, buzzards and eagles in times of war follow more the side of men whom they know beforehand will be wounded, slaughtered and butchered. And no less so are horses in battle happy from the side which victory must follow according to the giving God. Which straightaway I myself learned through my little son, Gottschalk, from our horse. For when Trpimir, a king of the Slavs, went against the people of the Greeks and their commanders and our villa was in the area of the coming battle, I said to [Gottschalk] that he should go and warn the king and his army as was altogether appropriate. I nonetheless abjured him terribly through the Lord God that he should neither take up arms nor advance with the army, but riding diligently after them he should direct his attention to whatever posture that horse of ours made and performed. For I knew most certainly that victory would come and would be to that side of men whose horses advanced happy and showed joy with their conquering posture. And so it soon happened as the bearing of the excited horse showed and made clear.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵³ Fine, *Early Medieval*, pp. 94–131 and 248–65; John Osborne, “Politics, Diplomacy and the Cult of Relics in Venice and the Northern Adriatic in the First Half of the Ninth Century,” *EME* 8 (1999), pp. 369–86; and Curta, *Southeastern*, pp. 134–47.

¹⁵⁴ Jonathan Shepard, “Slavs and Bulgars,” in *NCMH*, pp. 228–48.

¹⁵⁵ Francis Dvornik, *Byzantine Missions among the Slavs: Saints Constantine-Cyril and Methodius* (New Brunswick, NJ: 1970); Josef Bujnoch, *Zwischen Rom und Byzanz: Leben und Wirken der Slavenapostel Kyrillos und Methodios nach den Pannonischen Lebenden und der Klemensvita* (Vienna, 1977); Heinrich Löwe, “Cyrill und Methodius zwischen Byzanz und Rom,” *Settimane di studio del centro italiano di studi sull’alto medioevo* 30 (1983), pp. 631–86; and the previous note.

¹⁵⁶ A sixteenth-century copy of a charter dated 852 for a monastery in Rižinice, not far from old Roman Salona with Trpimir’s name in it is edited in *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, ed. Tadija Smiciklas (Zagreb, 1967), I, pp. 4–5. Boller, *Gottschalk*, p. 233 provides a photograph from the monastery bearing the inscription.

¹⁵⁷ Gottschalk, *Responsa de diversis*, *CEG*, p. 169: “Nec mirum cum etiam corvi milvi vultures et aquilae temporibus belli plus illam partem sequantur hominum quos praesentiunt vulnerandos et trucidandos atque iugulandos. Sic nihilominus et equi sunt in acie laeti ex ea parte quam deo dante debet victoria sequi. Quod prorsus ego ipse per Gottesscalcum filiolium meum de equo nostro probavi. Cum enim Tripemirus rex Sclavorum iret contra gentem Graecorum et patricium eorum et esset in ipso confinio futuri belli villa nostra, dixi illi ut iret et quicquid regi et eius exercitui necessarium esset sicut omnino deberet impenderet. Adiuravi tamen terribiliter eum per dominum deum ut nec arma sumeret

Gottschalk clearly felt he was an ally of Trpimir, and sought to help him by divining the outcome of the upcoming battle through the movements of his horse. The passage also reveals that Gottschalk was a respected figure residing at a villa with at least one companion—a boy in his care named Gottschalk like himself. Had Gottschalk abandoned his religious life in exchange for a secular one with lands and a son, his “little son” (*filiolus*) Gottschalk? The possibility certainly exists.¹⁵⁸ Yet Gottschalk frequently referred to his readers and correspondents as “son” or “little son,” and this younger Gottschalk could easily have been a follower who traveled with him and for whom he felt responsible.¹⁵⁹

Gottschalk later showed great interest in prophecy, writing much about it in his text *Responsa de diversis* while a prisoner at Hautvillers, and his divinatory abilities could have convinced Trpimir and his Croats that he was a genuine religious authority and reliable Christian advocate in Trpimir’s eyes.¹⁶⁰ Gottschalk’s teachings about predestination might have helped Trpimir and his Croats understand their choice to accept baptism as a sign of their election. Likewise, Gottschalk’s ability to predict the outcome of a battle by his soothsaying—while apparently unrelated to divine election in his own mind—could have convinced the Croats that he himself was among God’s elect, making his teachings and the prospect of receiving baptism from him very attractive.

To what extent, we might ask, was Gottschalk’s ability to divine the results of a battle a product of his Saxon heritage? Schröbler argued that Gottschalk’s knowledge of divination from birds and horses stemmed from his Saxon background, and was evidence of the Germanic influence on his thought.¹⁶¹ Schröbler posited that Gottschalk’s ideas about birds and horses reflected the same “Germanic imagination” evidenced in Tacitus’ *Germania* centuries before and in the eighth-century *Indiculus superstitionum et paganiarum*.¹⁶² Tacitus recorded that the ancient Germanic peoples practiced divination by examining the cries and flight patterns of birds and the warnings furnished by horses, such as snorting and neighing.¹⁶³ Schröbler suggested that Gottschalk, even growing up within the cloister, would have learned this knowledge due to his proximity to his fellow Saxon countrymen. Yet we might suggest instead that his knowledge of divination from birds and horses could have easily come from Tacitus himself: for a copy of his *Germania* existed at Fulda and was known to writers such as Einhard, Hrabanus,

nec cum exercitu pergeret, sed tamen studiose post eos equitans attenderet quemnam gestum equus ille noster ageret atque gereret. Ex olim siquidem certissime sciebam illi parti hominum venturam et futuram esse victoriam quorum equi incederent laeti monstrarentque gestu triumphando laetitiam. Sicque mox contigit ut equi gestientis gestus elicit atque protinus patefecit.”

¹⁵⁸ Kershaw, “Eberhard,” p. 93 posits this hypothesis.

¹⁵⁹ See the discussions about Gottschalk’s correspondents in Chapters 5 and 6.

¹⁶⁰ Gottschalk, *Responsa de diversis*, *CEG*, pp. 162–71.

¹⁶¹ Schröbler, “Glossen,” pp. 98–9 regarding divination, but her article as a whole contains such arguments.

¹⁶² Tacitus, *Germania*, 10, ed. Eric Herbert Warmington (Cambridge, MA: 1980), p. 146; and *MGH Cap. I*, No. 108, *Indiculus superstitionum et paganiarum*, 13, pp. 222–3, here 223: “De auguriis vel avium vel equorum . . .”

¹⁶³ Tacitus, *Germania*, 10, ed. Warmington, p. 146.

Freculf, and later Rudolf of Fulda.¹⁶⁴ Rather than being exclusively a matter of Saxon knowledge, avian and equestrian divination may have been the subject of academic discussion at Fulda based on Tacitus' work, perhaps especially of interest to those brothers who came from Germanic-speaking backgrounds and who had an interest in the ancient history of their lands.

Gottschalk's travels even took him as far as the Bulgar khaganate, where he continued his pattern of mingling with nobles as an acknowledged person of religious importance. He gave an anecdote about being in the land of the Bulgars, further east from Dalmatia, where he conversed with a pagan Bulgar nobleman about the Eucharist.¹⁶⁵ He probably acted as a missionary there as well, and perhaps even as an emissary from Eberhard or Trpimir, although unfortunately he gave no details about why he was there. He wrote: "For once, in the land of the Bulgars, a certain noble and strong pagan asked me humbly to drink in love of that God who makes his own blood from wine."¹⁶⁶ The chief point Gottschalk was trying to make was that even the pagans (*gentes*) knew that the Eucharist was really Christ's blood; but the remark reveals that his status in Bulgaria was that of a Christian priest who could perform the mass for converts, or at least for a curious pagan audience. Priestly power such as this—like his ability to divine the outcome of a battle or to discuss the predestination of God—no doubt served to place him among the Bulgars as a figure to respect and, possibly, to fear.

Now let us turn to Hrabanus' letter from 846 to Eberhard of Friuli which makes clear that Gottschalk was known to frequent Eberhard's household as his teacher (*doctor*).¹⁶⁷ By this point, the controversies surrounding Gottschalk's doctrine in Italy had been going on for several years, and as Hrabanus' letter indicates Eberhard was sympathetic to Gottschalk's teachings on predestination. Hrabanus wrote not only to discredit Gottschalk and his doctrine, but also to warn the duke to prevent him from teaching further. Hrabanus learned about Eberhard's connection to Gottschalk through his priests, Ascrih and Hrudpert, who had recently visited the duke in Friuli on their way home from Rome.¹⁶⁸ It is not clear from Hrabanus' letter whether Ascrih and Hrudpert had seen Gottschalk, or simply learned of his presence there while Gottschalk was away on his mission.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁴ Francis Haverfield, "Tacitus during the Late Roman Period and the Middle Ages," *Journal of Roman Studies* 6 (1915), pp. 196–200; *Texts and Transmissions: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, ed. Leighton Reynolds (Oxford, 1983), pp. 410–11; and Matthew Innes, "Teutons or Trojans? The Carolingians and the Germanic Past," in *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. id. and Yitzhak Hen (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 227–49, here 237–8.

¹⁶⁵ On the Bulgars, see Shepard, "Slavs and Bulgars," pp. 228–48.

¹⁶⁶ Gottschalk, *De corpore et sanguine domini*, *CEG*, pp. 324–37, here 325: "... nam quondam in terra Vulgarorum quidam nobilis potensque paganus bibere me suppliciter petivit in illius dei amore qui de vino sanguinem suum facit..." On this work see Celia Chazelle, "Exegesis in the Ninth-Century Eucharist Controversy," in *The Study of the Bible in the Carolingian Era*, ed. ead. and Burton Van Name Edwards (Turnhout, 2003), pp. 167–87, here 167 and 175–8.

¹⁶⁷ Traube, "Carmina," p. 712; Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, pp. 36–7; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, p. 21; Epperlein, *Herrschaft*, p. 230; Schrimpf, "Implikationen," p. 164; and Pezé, "*Primum in Italiam*," pp. 157–8.

¹⁶⁸ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 42, *MGH Epp.* V, p. 481; and Kershaw, "Arts of War," pp. 91–3.

¹⁶⁹ Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, p. 21. On Eberhard's role in encouraging missionary work among the Slavs, see *Translatio sancti Calixti Cisionium*, ed. Oswald Holder-Egger, *MGH SS* 15 (Berlin, 1887), pp. 418–22 and Krahwinkel, *Friaul*, pp. 252–61.

Hrabanus claimed Gottschalk and his followers were a heretical sect, and emphasized that Gottschalk's teachings had created scandal (*scandalum*) in many regions by making men despondent over the possibility of salvation if they had not received grace, and disobedient to their ecclesiastical superiors if they thought they had.¹⁷⁰ Hrabanus demanded that Eberhard must stop Gottschalk from preaching lest the duke risk divine wrath and public opprobrium through further scandal, for Gottschalk was not his learned teacher but a "know-it-all" (*sciolus*) charlatan whose "knowledge" caused division within the church and led many into error.¹⁷¹ Isidore of Seville had contrasted "know-it all" (*sciolus*) with "someone knowing" (*sciens*) in his work *De differentiis*: "Someone who 'knows' is experienced in knowledge and things; a know-it-all is the opposite of someone knowing, a simulator of knowledge and experience; and whatever another knows, he wishes to appear to know too: either he claims to know everything, or even to predict the future."¹⁷² Hrabanus, well-versed in Isidore's works, intended the learned Eberhard to understand that Gottschalk was a wicked fraud, whose claims to knowledge about divine secrets were a sham.¹⁷³

Hrabanus especially attacked Gottschalk's interpretation of Augustine on predestination, stating that he knew Gottschalk had a short compilation of the church father's writings.¹⁷⁴ Hrabanus stressed that his own position on predestination was faithful to that of Augustine. He included a short quotation from Augustine's *De praedestinatione sanctorum*, which Hrabanus identified as the church father's, and which he claimed illustrated Augustine's agreement with his own position since Augustine distinguished the difference between predestination and foreknowledge and regarded predestination as only related to the good in the same way Hrabanus did.¹⁷⁵ Hrabanus then quickly shifted from Augustine to Prosper, whom he characterized as the church father's faithful interpreter and protector of his teachings against those "who either not understanding or not wishing that these things be understood which were correctly written there, tried to pervert them to a depraved meaning."¹⁷⁶ According to Hrabanus, Prosper's various *Responsiones*, fifth-century apologetic texts meant to defend his interpretation of Augustine's thought, were the distilled essence of that thought, accurately conveying the church

¹⁷⁰ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 42, *MGH Epp.* V, p. 481.

¹⁷¹ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 42, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 481–2 and 487. On scandal, see de Jong, *Penitential*, pp. 153–70, 195–205, and 228–41.

¹⁷² Isidore of Seville, *Diferencias libro I*, ed. Carmen Codoñer (Paris, 1992), p. 106: "Inter scientem et sciolum. Sciens est peritus scientia et rebus; sciolus, simulator scientiae et peritiae, scienti contrarius est; et quidquid alius sciat, ipse videri vellet scire; aut qui se profitetur scire omnia, aut etiam futura praedicare."

¹⁷³ On Hrabanus' knowledge of Isidore, see Franz-Josef Holtkemper, "Kompilation und Originalität bei Hrabanus Maurus," in *Pädagogische Blätter. Heinrich Döpp-Vorwald zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. idem (Düsseldorf, 1967), pp. 58–75.

¹⁷⁴ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 42, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 481–2.

¹⁷⁵ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 42, *MGH Epp.* V, p. 482; and Augustine, *De praedestinatione sanctorum*, 10, 19, ed. Jean Chéné and Jacques Pintard (Paris, 1962), pp. 438–597, here 522. On this text, see Rebecca Harden Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency: A Study of the Semi-Pelagian Controversy* (Macon, GA: 1996), pp. 50–9 and 94–8. See also Schrimpf, "Implikationen," p. 165.

¹⁷⁶ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 42, *MGH Epp.* V, p. 482: "qui aut non intelligendo, aut intellegi ea nolendo que ibi recte scripta sunt, in pravam sensum abducere conabantur."

father's beliefs on predestination, free will, and grace. Hrabanus excerpted each of the fifteen chapters of Prosper's *Responsiones ad capitula Gallorum*, supplementing them with a few quotations from *Responsiones ad capitula objectionum Vincentiaranum* and *Responsiones ad excerpta Genuensium*.¹⁷⁷ These excerpts formed the bulk of his evidence and the same arguments here as he had taken from Prosper in his earlier treatise. By shaping his argument with Prosper's earlier defense of Augustine's thought, Hrabanus cast his dispute with Gottschalk as a replay of the fifth-century debate over grace and predestination, adopting Prosper's "true" interpretation of Augustine's thought from that debate for his own position against Gottschalk. By so doing, Hrabanus laid claim (as he did in his treatise for Noting) to the patristic legacy—including Augustine's authority—for his position and transformed Gottschalk's reading of Augustine's works into heresy.¹⁷⁸

Hrabanus then revisited the argument of his *De praedestinatione* that divine mysteries are secrets not meant to be studied by the unlearned, and he quoted a series of biblical passages and an excerpt from Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Job* to impress upon Eberhard that irresponsible people doing so posed a great danger for the faithful.¹⁷⁹ Hrabanus' purpose was to convince Eberhard that the question of predestination was beyond his skills and he should leave it to responsible churchmen such as Hrabanus (rather than Gottschalk) to answer his questions and explain the true faith to him. In this way, Hrabanus claimed that the right to be a theologian and to practice politics on a cosmic scale was reserved for a select few. Eberhard's task, however, was to give up Gottschalk's "sect" and to force him to cease preaching.¹⁸⁰

However Eberhard responded to Hrabanus' particular articulation of predestination, the duke could not overlook the danger of being associated with scandal and may have sent Gottschalk north to Hrabanus in 848 to be heard at the Synod of Mainz. Hincmar's later account that Gottschalk was "thrown out in disgrace" (*turpiter ejectus*) from Italy would support such a hypothesis, although it was clearly in the archbishop of Rheims' interest to characterize Gottschalk's past in the worst possible light.¹⁸¹ Yet Eberhard kept Augustine's *Enchiridion* for the rest of his life, and must have realized that Hrabanus' understanding of predestination differed significantly from that found in the great church father's work. Perhaps the duke retained sympathy for Gottschalk's teachings, but thought it too politically dangerous to protect him publicly or support him later after he had been condemned.

¹⁷⁷ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 42, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 482–6; and Prosper, *Vincentiaranum*, 2, 4, and 7–10, *PL* 51: 179–80 and 181–3; id., *Gallorum*, pars prima, 1–8 and pars secunda, 8–15, *PL* 51: 157–65 and 172–4; and id., *Responsiones ad excerpta Genuensium*, *PL* 51: 187–202, here 194–5.

¹⁷⁸ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 42, *MGH Epp.* V, p. 486.

¹⁷⁹ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 42, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 486–7; Gregory, *Moralia*, XVI, 38, ed. Adriaen, pp. 437–8, discussing Exodus 21, 13. On this see Kershaw, "Eberhard," pp. 95–7. The biblical references include: Num 20, 17 and 21, 22; Ps 85, 11; Ps 26, 11, Ps 118, 29–30, Jo 4, 6, 8, 12, and 10, 19; Rom 12, 3; Prov 25, 16; I Cor 3, 1–2, 2, 6–7, and 14, 26, and 40.

¹⁸⁰ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 42, *MGH Epp.* V, p. 487.

¹⁸¹ *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 849, ed. Grat et al., pp. 56–7.

THE CONDEMNATION OF GOTTSCHALK AT THE SYNOD OF MAINZ (848)

When Gottschalk traveled back over the Alps in 847 or 848 to face his accuser at Mainz, both he and the world around him had changed dramatically. Gottschalk had spent a decade teaching and defending his doctrine of predestination, stirring up controversy in Italy before, during, and after the conflicts of the early 840s. For much of that time Gottschalk had supporters and detractors, and questions of grace seem to have been a topic of theological discussion in Italy. For his supporters, Gottschalk's message offered hope for the possibility of salvation in a time beset by sin, disorder, infidelity, and conflict. Yet for his enemies, Gottschalk's doctrines appeared to be part of that evil and disorder.¹⁸² As previously noted, the new realms' kings and bishops at church councils in the mid-840s sought to reestablish order and restore purity to the church. In this atmosphere of the now divided empire, Gottschalk found himself facing the full force of the Carolingian engine of reform when he arrived at the Synod of Mainz in 848.

Yet when Gottschalk learned of Hrabanus' accusations in his letter to Eberhard, the situation may not have seemed so dire. For in 842 Hrabanus was disgraced for his support of Lothar after Louis the German secured his hold on the eastern realm at the end of hostilities in 842, and he retired or was driven out as abbot of Fulda.¹⁸³ From 842 to 847 Hrabanus was a figure without rank, and Gottschalk must have thought that his exiled enemy would be less dangerous. But developments were taking place in the eastern kingdom that would change the circumstances of Gottschalk's and Hrabanus' confrontation, and contribute directly to the former's condemnation for heresy.¹⁸⁴ By 847 Hrabanus managed to regain Louis' favor perhaps through the intervention of Lothar and Drogo of Metz, and in that same year his fortunes changed when Archbishop Otgar of Mainz died.¹⁸⁵ Louis made Hrabanus Archbishop of Mainz and ordered him in that same year to hold a synod there, which Hrabanus used as an occasion to implement church reform in the eastern realm.¹⁸⁶

As Gottschalk journeyed north, he may have sought out old friends to help him against Hrabanus. He sent a verse letter to Walahfrid Strabo, now Abbot of Reichenau and occasional royal emissary.¹⁸⁷ Perhaps Gottschalk passed through

¹⁸² Dutton, *The Politics of Dreaming*, pp. 130–2 emphasizes this point especially.

¹⁸³ Mechthild Sandmann, "Hrabanus als Mönch, Abt und Erzbischof," in *Hrabanus und seine Schule*, ed. Winfried Browe (Fulda, 1980), pp. 13–47, here 38–43; Bat-Sheva Albert, "Raban Maur, l'unité de l'empire et ses relations avec les Carolingiens," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 86 (1991), pp. 23–37, here pp. 16–21 and 23–32; and *Annals*, trans. Reuter, p. 26, n. 6.

¹⁸⁴ On Louis the German, see *Ludwig der Deutsche und seine Zeit*, ed. Wilfried Hartmann (Darmstadt, 2004); and Goldberg, *Struggle for Empire*, esp. pp. 117–230 for the period after the civil war.

¹⁸⁵ Hrabanus, *Epistolae* 33, 34, and 35, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 465–70; Albert, "Raban Maur," pp. 33–6; and Goldberg, *Struggle*, pp. 158–60.

¹⁸⁶ Wilfried Hartmann, "Die Mainzer Synoden des Hrabanus Maurus," in *Hrabanus Maurus: Lehrer, Abt und Bischof*, ed. Raymond Kottje and Harald Zimmermann (Wiesbaden, 1982), pp. 130–44.

¹⁸⁷ Depreux, *Prosopographie*, pp. 393–4.

the monastery on his way north, for Walahfrid's verse letter, *Velox Calliope*, indicates that Gottschalk had "returned home"—possibly meaning either Reichenau or Fulda—but it does not mention the predestination controversy, dating it likely before the Synod of Mainz in October, 848.¹⁸⁸ Walahfrid died not long after writing the letter, drowning in the River Loire while returning from an embassy to Charles the Bald, and he was not involved in the debates about grace. Walahfrid knew of Gottschalk's great knowledge of Augustine, and called him "Fulgentius" in his letter, comparing him to the church father's interpreter of predestination of that name, and suggesting that he would have been Gottschalk's ally in the controversy had he lived.¹⁸⁹ Gottschalk may have also looked for support from his old Fulda ally, Hatto, who had become abbot of Fulda in 842 when Hrabanus stepped down.¹⁹⁰ As Abbot of Fulda, Hatto could have spoken on behalf of Gottschalk to King Louis, whom he visited at court several times during the 840s.¹⁹¹ Yet the evidence from the Synod of Mainz gives no clear indication that Hatto helped Gottschalk.

There is evidence that Gottschalk approached the Synod of Mainz intending to argue with Hrabanus and to prove by means of textual authorities and a critique of the archbishop's position that his own teachings were orthodox. For this purpose he brought his own text to the council, and Hincmar preserved a few excerpts of it in his *Liber de praedestinatione*, calling it "the little book of his error" (*libellus sui erroris*).¹⁹² This *Libellus* may have been an expanded form of his book of excerpts from Augustine, mentioned by Hrabanus in his letter to Eberhard, but as it survives only in excerpts chosen by Hincmar, our knowledge of his position at Mainz is limited to a few points that were meant to illustrate his "error." Nevertheless these excerpts provide valuable clues as to Gottschalk's methods of argument and how he planned to use these techniques to impress his audience.

The text included both a *confessio* of faith, outlining in brief his position, and a defense of that position, involving a critique of Hrabanus' treatise to Noting. Gottschalk emphasized that predestination was twin and that Christ had not died for the reprobate.¹⁹³ The overall tone of the excerpts reveals the contradictory nature of Gottschalk's criticisms of Hrabanus: on the one hand Gottschalk feigned respect for the archbishop by referring to him as "venerable pontiff" (*venerandus pontifex*), but on the other hand Gottschalk suggested Hrabanus had not read scripture "skillfully and soberly" (*solerter ac sobrie*) so as to understand it correctly and that the archbishop had relied on unorthodox authorities such as Gennadius rather than Augustine when coming to his conclusions.¹⁹⁴ In other words,

¹⁸⁸ Walahfrid, *Gotesscalcho monacho*, *PLAC* II, p. 362; Traube, "Carmina," p. 712, Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, p. 19; Alf Önnersfors, "Walahfrid Strabo als Dichter," in *Die Abtei Reichenau. Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte und Kultur des Inselklosters*, ed. Helmut Maurer (Sigmaringen, 1974), pp. 83–114, here 103–4; and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 254–7.

¹⁸⁹ Walahfrid, *Gotesscalcho monacho*, *PLAC* II, p. 362. On Carolingian nicknames, see Garrison, "Social World," pp. 59–79.

¹⁹⁰ Mechthild Sandmann, "Die Folge der Äbte," in *Die Klostergemeinschaft von Fulda im früheren Mittelalter*, ed. Karl Schmid (Munich, 1978), I, pp. 178–204, here 186.

¹⁹¹ Sandmann, "Folge," p. 186.

¹⁹² Hincmar, *Liber*, 2, *PL* 125: 84.

¹⁹³ Hincmar, *Liber*, 5, 21, 24, 27, and 29, *PL* 125: 89–90, 182, 211, 275, 289, and 291.

¹⁹⁴ Hincmar, *Liber*, 5 and 21, *PL* 125: 89–90 and 182.

Gottschalk criticized Hrabanus' understanding of predestination and free will by criticizing his abilities and methods as a theologian, which questioned Hrabanus' authority as archbishop. As a mere priest, such a critique was not Gottschalk's to make, and overall it reveals how Gottschalk would appear to the bishops at the synod: feigning respect for their authority, while displaying a distinct lack of the appropriate deference when discussing doctrine. The way Gottschalk presented his doctrinal position in texts such as his *libellus* were generally regarded as extreme even by those who would agree with him in the 840s and 850s, so one can only imagine how they appeared to the bishops at the synod.¹⁹⁵

The *confessio* is the first of a series of such texts produced by Gottschalk in the late 840s, and it is important as his first surviving statement on predestination:

I, Gottschalk, believe and confess, profess and testify from God the Father, through God the Son and in God the Holy Spirit, and I affirm and approve in the presence of God and his saints that predestination is twin, whether of the elect to peace or of the reprobate to death; because just as the unchangeable God predestined before the establishment of the world all of his saints unchangeably through his own freely given grace to eternal life, likewise this very same unchangeable God wholly predestined through his just judgement all of the reprobate, who on the day of judgement will be deservedly damned on account of the merit of their evils to everlasting death.¹⁹⁶

Here we see for the first time Gottschalk's characterization of his doctrine as a creed. His formula—"I believe and I confess" (*credo et confiteor*)—was one used by early medieval theologians to characterize their positions as the orthodox faith, following Paul's Letter to the Romans 10, 10, where he avowed that belief in and confession of Christ led to justice and salvation. Even in later sections of the *libellus* Gottschalk repeatedly emphasized his loyalty to the most controversial aspects of his doctrine, claiming: "I believe most faithfully, I speak with the greatest fidelity, and equally most certainly and most fruitfully I confess and most truthfully profess" that Christ did not die for the reprobate.¹⁹⁷ While church synods were the proper place to discuss the nature of the creed, the exuberance of Gottschalk's professions for a hitherto unheard of doctrine must have appeared shocking and utterly subversive to the synod's episcopal audience.

The tradition of *formulae* to emphasize one's fidelity to a doctrine began in the early church with creeds like the Nicene Creed, and Carolingian authors and

¹⁹⁵ Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, pp. 71–4; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 68–74; and Chazelle, *Crucified God*, pp. 172–81.

¹⁹⁶ Gottschalk, *Fragmentum* 15, *ÆG*, p. 38: "Ego Gothescalcus credo et confiteor profiteor et testificor ex deo patre per deum filium in deo spiritu sancto, et adfirmo atque approbo coram deo et sanctis eius quod gemina est praedestinatio sive electorum ad requiem sive reprobrorum ad mortem, quia sicut deus incommutabilis ante mundi constitutionem omnes electos suos incommutabiliter per gratuitam gratiam suam praedestinavit ad vitam aeternam, similiter omnino omnes reprobos qui in die iudicii damnabuntur propter ipsorum mala merita idem ipse incommutabilis deus per iustum iudicium suum incommutabiliter praedestinavit ad mortem merito sempiternam."

¹⁹⁷ Hincmar, *Liber*, 29, *PL* 125: 290: "fidelissime credo fidentissime loquor et certissime pariter ac fructuissime confiteor atque veracissime profiteor . . ."

bishops understood themselves as working within this tradition.¹⁹⁸ During the doctrinal disputes of Charlemagne's reign, including the Adoptionism and image-related controversies, the formula was employed by the Frankish court at synods to characterize its position as the "orthodox" one, and that of its foreign opponents as "heresy."¹⁹⁹ Hrabanus used the formula in his treatise for Noting, when he instructed the bishop that Hrabanus had given him a statement of the orthodox position on predestination, which he should believe and confess and then preach to his congregation. Gottschalk similarly used the formula to represent his position as the "orthodox" one at Mainz, and was prepared to dismantle Hrabanus' argument before the bishops.

Something worth noting about Gottschalk's criticism of Hrabanus' use of authorities was that Gottschalk suggested the archbishop should read the pseudo-Augustinian *Hypomnesticon* instead of Gennadius' writings.²⁰⁰ As we have seen already, Hrabanus cited the *Hypomnesticon* at length in his treatise sent to Noting, although Hrabanus did not indicate that he did so and his reading of the text was quite different from Gottschalk's. Obviously Gottschalk saw Hrabanus' use of Gennadius' work as grounds for attack. Augustine did not (as previously discussed) write the *Hypomnesticon*, which was an interpretation of his thought by a fifth-century theologian who supported a position somewhat closer to that of Hrabanus, and Gottschalk's later treatises do not show any evidence that he cited this text himself.²⁰¹ The *Hypomnesticon* would also be used by Hincmar as a genuine Augustinian text to support his position on predestination,²⁰² although Florus of Lyons would expose this text as a work by another author.²⁰³ Nevertheless Gottschalk's criticisms of Hrabanus' choice of patristic authorities reveal how Carolingian theologians read such texts through the lens of their own doctrines, as well as the fact that Gottschalk expected any debate at the synod to include discussion of which ancient texts were authoritative and how such texts should be interpreted.

Before examining the Synod of Mainz in 848, it is important consider the significance of Hrabanus' debut as archbishop at the Synod of Mainz in 847, since the events there set the stage for his confrontation with Gottschalk the following year. This was an important moment in Hrabanus' episcopate, when he sought to establish himself as a reformer by issuing a series of canons aimed at correcting and purifying the church and by prosecuting an accused false prophetess, Thiota of Alemannia. Thiota's trial, an account of which survives in the *Annales Fuldenses*, had common features with Gottschalk's the following year.²⁰⁴ According

¹⁹⁸ *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. Norman Tanner et al., 2 vols. (Washington DC: 1990), here I, p. 5. See also: John Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 3rd ed. (London, 1972), pp. 205–54.

¹⁹⁹ *MGH Conc.* I, No. 19 [Frankfurt, 794], pp. 155, 162, and 163–4; *MGH Conc.* I, No. 25 [Aachen, 800], pp. 220–5, here 222 (Felix of Urgel's *confessio*); Alcuin, *Contra Felicem*, *PL* 101: 127, 148, 152, 172–3, 198, 204, 218, and 225; and Theodulf (?), *Opus Caroli*, ed. Freeman and Meyvaert, pp. 336–40. See also Cavadini, *Last Christology*, pp. 24–70.

²⁰⁰ Hincmar, *Liber*, 5, *PL* 125: 182.

²⁰¹ Although see his apparent allusions to the *Hypomnesticon*, discussed in Chapter 6.

²⁰² Chazelle, *Crucified*, p. 166.

²⁰³ Zechiel-Eckes, *Florus von Lyon*, pp. 181–7.

²⁰⁴ On Thiota, see Suzanne Fonay Wemple, *Women in Frankish Society: Marriage and the Cloister, 500–900* (Philadelphia, 1981), p. 145; Jane Tibbetts Schulenberg, "Female Sanctity: Public and

to the annalist, the “pseudo-prophetess” Thiota was brought before the synod for causing upheaval in her diocese by professing to know the date of the end of the world and other things “known to God alone, as if they had been divinely revealed to her,” so that many terrified clerics and lay people brought her gifts and sought out her prayers.²⁰⁵ The bishops at the synod questioned Thiota until she admitted that her prophecies were part of a conspiracy for economic gain undertaken with a certain priest, and then the synod had her publicly beaten to punish her for “unreasonably having seized and presumed to claim for herself against ecclesiastical custom” the ministry of preaching.²⁰⁶

Visions, dreams, and prophecies were neither unheard of nor universally condemned in the ninth century, and Thiota was not alone in claiming that she received divine knowledge.²⁰⁷ Whether Thiota was genuinely a fraud or not, the annal account suggests that she confessed at the synod because she simply could not withstand the bishops’ tremendous authority and hostile response to her activities. An important point of comparison between Thiota’s case and Gottschalk’s the next year is their critics’ view of their teachings. Gottschalk’s preaching about predestination and Thiota’s prophecies about the end of the world were characterized in much of the same terminology—falsehood and error, as well as the “secrets of God”—by the bishops and annalists, indeed by Hrabanus too in his writings to Noting and Eberhard. Also, the bishops viewed Thiota’s preaching as a usurpation of their right to determine doctrine, showing again how the church hierarchy reserved the right to practice theology for itself. When Gottschalk appeared before the synod in 848, the bishops (under Hrabanus’ guidance) had the experience of Thiota’s trial in mind and identified Gottschalk as a false teacher of a similar ilk, but perhaps even more dangerous because of his learning.

Another of Hrabanus’ key reforms at the synod of 847 was the reissuing of the canons of the 813 Synod of Mainz, which had direct relevance to Gottschalk’s case.²⁰⁸ These canons dealt with everything from doctrinal issues and the behavior of the clergy to questions of homicide, penance, and incest.²⁰⁹ Under Hrabanus’ guidance, the council of bishops emphasized to Louis the German the importance of restoring order among monks according to the Rule of Benedict, and of preventing

Private Roles, ca. 500–1000,” in *Women and Power in the Middle Ages*, ed. Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (Athens, GA: 1988) p. 116; Janet Nelson, “Women and the Word,” *Studies in Church History* 27 (1990), pp. 53–78, here 73–4; and Dutton, *The Politics of Dreaming*, pp. 126–8, who places Thiota within the tradition of ninth-century apocalyptic thought.

²⁰⁵ *Annales Fuldenses*, s.a. 847, ed. Friedrich Kurze, *MGH SSRG* 7 (Hanover, 1891), pp. 36–7, here p. 37: “aliaque perplura dei solius notitiae cognita quasi divinitus sibi revelata.”

²⁰⁶ *Annales Fuldenses*, s.a. 847, ed. Kurze, p. 37: “inrationabiliter arripuit et sibi contra morem ecclesiasticum vindicare praesumpsit.”

²⁰⁷ Dutton, *Politics*, especially pp. 128–56, where he examines the prophetic visions of Audradus Modicus; and Firey, *Contrite Heart*, pp. 154–6.

²⁰⁸ *MGH Conc.* III, No. 14 [Mainz, 847], pp. 150–77, including pp. 159–77, which contains the canons of the synod that were based on those of Mainz 813 and Hrabanus’ work on penance. See also Sandmann, “Hraban als Mönch,” pp. 41–7; and Hartmann, “Die Mainzer Synoden,” pp. 130–44.

²⁰⁹ *MGH Conc.* III, No. 14 [Mainz, 847], p. 163 lists the capitula.

them from being involved in the affairs of the world.²¹⁰ Regarding the faith, the council legislated that works and faith together were the only way to please God.²¹¹ Using the example of the first Christian emperor, Constantine I, Hrabanus and the council in 847 encouraged Louis to defend the honor of the church, preserve its peace and tranquility, and to protect the “pure Christian religion” (*religio christiana incontaminata*) and the “pure worship of God” (*cultus dei incontaminatus*) from insolent “corruptors of God’s temple” (*corruptores templi dei*) and “contaminators of holy places” (*contaminatores sacrorum locorum*), while the bishops reformed and reproved them.²¹²

The significance of Hrabanus’ concern for purity is revealing about how the bishops at the synod viewed the church. Historians have examined purity as an issue of early medieval sexuality, kinship, and incest, and dietary concerns in relation to Christianity—as well as sin in general.²¹³ Heresy and doctrinal error were also forms of spiritual “impurity” during this same period, as the work of Abigail Firey demonstrates.²¹⁴ Yet the word Hrabanus and the synod of Mainz used to describe Christianity—pure (*incontaminata*)—was not one traditionally used by Frankish prelates, who preferred to describe their religion (*religio*) as true (*vera*) or correct (*recta*).²¹⁵ He may have taken the idea from a prayer to the Trinity drawn from Hilary’s *De Trinitate* included in a prayerbook associated with Alcuin, his teacher, which contains a line with the unusual language: “Preserve the pure

²¹⁰ Sources include Hrabanus’ letter to Louis the German and the synodal canons: *MGH Conc.* III, No. 14 [Mainz, 847], pp. 160–1 and 168–9.

²¹¹ *MGH Conc.* III, No. 14 [Mainz, 847], pp. 163–4.

²¹² *MGH Conc.* III, No. 14 [Mainz, 847], pp. 162 and 177. On comparisons between Carolingian rulers and Constantine, see Eugen Ewig, “Das Bild Constantins des Grossen in den Ersten Jahrhunderten des abendländischen Mittelalters,” in *Spätantikes und fränkisches Gallien. Gesammelte Schriften* (1952–1973), ed. Hartmut Atsma, 2 vols. (Munich, 1979), I, pp. 72–113, here 98–113; and Godman, *Poets and Emperors*, pp. 58–9, 121, and 161–4.

²¹³ Key works in a vast bibliography include: Pierre Payer, *Sex and the Penitentials* (Toronto, 1984), pp. 55–71; Joseph Lynch, *Godparents and Kinship in Early Medieval Europe* (Princeton, 1986), especially pp. 219–81; James Brundage, *Law, Sex, and Christian Society in Medieval Europe* (Chicago, 1987), pp. 124–77; Mayke de Jong, “To the Limits of Kinship: Anti-Incest Legislation in the Early Medieval West (500–900),” in *From Sappho to De Sade: Moments in the History of Sexuality*, ed. Jan Bremmer (London, 1989), pp. 36–59; Meens, “Pollution,” pp. 3–19; Joseph Lynch, *Christianizing Kinship: Ritual Sponsorship in Anglo-Saxon England* (Ithaca, NY: 1998), especially pp. 151–88; Giselle de Nie, “‘Contagium’ and Images of Self in Late Sixth-Century Gaul,” in *Purity and Holiness: The Heritage of Leviticus*, ed. Marcel Poorthuis and Joshua Schwartz (Leiden, 2000), pp. 247–61; Rob Meens, “‘A Relic of Superstition’: Bodily Impurity and the Church from Gregory the Great to the Twelfth-Century Decretists,” in *Purity and Holiness: The Heritage of Leviticus*, ed. Marcel Poorthuis and Joshua Schwartz, (Leiden, 2000), pp. 281–93; Albrecht Diem, *Das Monastische Experiment: Die Rolle der Keuschheit bei der Entstehung des westlichen Klosterwesens* (Münster, 2005); Firey, *A Contrite Heart*, pp. 60–110; and Coon, *Dark Age Bodies*, pp. 98–133.

²¹⁴ Firey, *Contrite Heart*, pp. 135–58. For the later period, however, see Robert Moore, “Heresy as Disease,” in *The Concept of Heresy in the Middle Ages (11th–13th C.) Proceedings of the International Conference, Louvain May 13–16, 1973*, ed. Willem Lourdaux and D. Verhelst (Leuven, 1976), pp. 1–11 who examines descriptions of heresy in terms of diseases such as leprosy; and id., *Formation of a Persecuting Society*, pp. 11–25 and 62–116.

²¹⁵ Hrabanus, for example, drew upon such language from previous synodal canons in 847; see *MGH Conc.* III, No. 14 [Mainz, 847], pp. 159 and 160.

religion of my faith.”²¹⁶ From an early period, Hrabanus used the term *incontaminatus* to describe Christ and the eternal life he offered to the faithful in his devotional, pedagogical, and theological writings, drawing on Peter’s First Epistle 1, 4 and 1, 19.²¹⁷ He extended this Christ image of purity when he was abbot of Fulda to Mary, and ultimately to the faithful—especially to monks—in homilies and exegetical works, urging them to maintain the purity of their bodies and lives.²¹⁸ In his exposition of Paul’s Second Letter to the Corinthians, Hrabanus emphasized to his monastic audience the importance of virginity in maintaining purity, writing that women were the beginnings of corruption, idolatry, error, and heresy.²¹⁹ Such a discussion of women is not surprising in a monastic context, and it reveals that Hrabanus as abbot viewed the world outside the cloister as a source of pollution for monks.²²⁰ As archbishop, Hrabanus brought his monastic concern for purity to the religion of Louis the German’s realm as a whole, viewing spiritual impurities—the teachings first of Thiotia and then of Gottschalk—as a danger needing to be cleansed or, at least, removed.

Like the preceding year’s synod, the Synod of Mainz in October, 848 was meant to reform the church in the eastern realm.²²¹ In addition to conducting Gottschalk’s hearing, Hrabanus demanded that ecclesiastical property being held by secular lords be returned to the church, a move that aroused the ire of some of the realm’s nobles and must have contributed to the tense atmosphere at the gathering.²²² Whether Gottschalk arrived at Mainz escorted by Eberhard’s men or of his own free will, the limited evidence suggests that Hrabanus took precautions to prevent Gottschalk from speaking and using his highly-honed debate skills at the synod. Quite likely Hrabanus had prepared the bishops beforehand to see Gottschalk—the archbishop’s disloyal pupil from the synod of 829—as a wayward monk, and a wicked know-it-all spreading his fabricated, deceitful, and heretical teachings to unsuspecting Christians and endangering the safety and purity of the church.

The *Annales Fuldenses* offer two brief reports on the synod from 848 regarding Gottschalk. The first indicates that the heretic Gottschalk was convicted by Archbishop Hrabanus and many bishops “as seemed reasonable to many”

²¹⁶ *Libellus Turonensis*, ed. Wilmar, p. 102: “Conserva fidei meae incontaminatam religionem.” See also Hilary, *De Trinitate*, XII, 57, ed. Pieter Smulders, CCSL 62–62A (Turnhout, 1979–80), here CCSL 62, p. 627.

²¹⁷ Hrabanus, *In honorem sanctae crucis*, I, 1, C1, ed. Michel Perrin, CCCM 100 (Turnhout, 1997), p. 29; id., *De institutione*, I, 31, ed. Zimpel, I, p. 224; id., *Exodum*, PL 108: 9–246, here 58; id., *Commentarium in Leviticum*, PL 108: 245–586, here 481; id., *Commentaria in libros iv Regum*, PL 109: 9–280, here 182; id., *Commentarium in librum Ecclesiasticum*, PL 109: 763–1126, here 933; and id., *Homiliae*, PL 110: 9–468, here 189. See also I Pt 1, 4: “in hereditatem incorruptibilem et incontaminatam et inmarcescibilem conservatam in caelis in vobis,” and 1, 19: “sed pretioso sanguine quasi agni incontaminati et immaculati Christi.”

²¹⁸ Hrabanus, *Leviticum*, PL 108: 482, here referring to Mary; id., *Enarrationes in librum Numerorum*, PL 108: 587–838, here 694; id., *Regum*, PL 109: 206; id., *Sapientiae*, PL 109: 672, 717–18, and 728; id., *Homiliae*, PL 110: 420; and id., *Enarrationes in epistolas beati Pauli*, PL: 111: 1273–1616, here 1541 and PL 112: 9–834, here 61, 204, 219, 363, 373, and 387.

²¹⁹ Hrabanus, *Pauli*, PL 112: 219–20.

²²⁰ Coon, *Dark Age Bodies*, pp. 232–6.

²²¹ *MGH Conc.* III, No. 16 [Mainz, 848], pp. 179–84.

²²² Goldberg, *Struggle*, p. 162.

(*rationabiliter ut plurimis visum fuit*) but he persisted in his opinion.²²³ The second, more elaborate account notes how the priest Gottschalk, who “understanding the predestination of God wickedly and affirming that the good were unavoidably predestined by God to life and the wicked to perpetual death” was condemned at the synod as seemed reasonable to many, and was sent to his archbishop, Hincmar of Rheims after swearing an oath never return to the eastern kingdom.²²⁴

The first account makes clear that Hrabanus was the leading figure behind Gottschalk’s conviction at the synod, that the judgment that he was a heretic was not unanimous,²²⁵ and that Gottschalk refused to recant. Unfortunately the identity of the bishops and abbots at the council is unknown, yet Gottschalk must have had supporters there—perhaps Hatto of Fulda—who disputed or were troubled by his condemnation. The second account gives more information about Gottschalk’s teachings and emphasizes that Gottschalk swore not return to Louis’ kingdom, a measure surely meant to protect and purify the church of the realm, as outlined in the canons of the synod of 847. This was important, since, as the first account indicated, Gottschalk did not abandon his teachings.

Another account in the *Annales Xantenses* lists Gottschalk’s trial as one among a series of evils befalling the realm, associating it with Viking attacks and natural disasters.²²⁶ The annalist did not name Gottschalk, but instead described with obvious relief how the synod convicted a “sect” (*secta*) of monks for its teachings about God’s predestination, and beat them publicly before returning them to Gaul in order to preserve the state of the church “unharmd” (*inlesus*).²²⁷ Some scholars have argued that the annalist confused the events of Mainz, 848 with those of Quierzy, 849, where Gottschalk is known from other sources to have been beaten with rods for insulting the bishops and for refusing to recant his teachings,²²⁸ an act that reduced him as a monk back to the status of novice.²²⁹ Yet the annalist clearly recorded that the sect of monks was lashed and then sent to Gaul *after*. Gottschalk must have been beaten in both places, suffering the monastic punishment for his unwillingness to be corrected.

Viewing the annalists’ accounts in the context of the canons of 847, one can see that the bishops viewed Gottschalk and his “sect” as an impure threat to the church that had to be removed and sent elsewhere, across the Rhine never to return. Following the synod in October, Hrabanus sent Gottschalk to Hincmar along with his own account of the trial, which survives in Hincmar’s *Liber de praedestinatione*. The text is important, since it is one of the only surviving documents from the trial and it reveals details of how Hrabanus had characterized Gottschalk and his

²²³ *Annales Fuldenses*, s.a. 848, ed. Kurze, p. 38.

²²⁴ *Annales Fuldenses*, s.a. 848, ed. Kurze, p. 38: “de praedestinatione Dei prave sentiens et tam bonos ad vitam quam malos ad mortem perpetuam inevitabiliter a Deo praedestinos esse adfirmans.”

²²⁵ Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, p. 40 emphasized this point.

²²⁶ On the tendency for Frankish authors to link Viking attacks with internal disasters and upheaval, see Dutton, *Politics of Dreaming*, pp. 140, 142–3, 146, and 152–3; and Simon Coupland, “The Rod of God’s Wrath or the People of God’s Wrath? The Carolingian Theology of the Viking Invasions,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 42 (1991), pp. 535–54.

²²⁷ *Annales Xantenses*, s.a. 848, ed. Bernhard von Simson, *MGH SSRG* 12 (Hanover, 1909), p. 16.

²²⁸ Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, p. 40.

²²⁹ Coon, *Dark Age Bodies*, pp. 85–7.

teachings to the bishops there. While it was the first known communication between Hrabanus and Hincmar about Gottschalk, Hrabanus had corresponded with Hincmar's teacher Hilduin of Saint-Denis about Gottschalk in the 830s, which could mean that Hincmar was already aware of Gottschalk as a potential threat to order.²³⁰ In his letter to Hincmar, Hrabanus described Gottschalk as a "wandering monk" (*gyrovagus monachus*) with a doubtful claim to the priesthood, who in Italy had been introducing new superstitions and harmful doctrine about the predestination of God and sending people into error, saying that "there are some in this world, who on account of God's predestination, which compels them to go to death, cannot reform themselves from error and sin, as if God made them incorrigible from the beginning and to go subject to punishment to eternal death."²³¹ The Synod of Mainz found Gottschalk "impervious to reform" (*incorrigibilis*) and sent him to Hincmar to be shut away lest he seduce more Christians into error. The great danger, according to Hrabanus, was that many of the "less devoted" (*minus devoti*) already thought wrongly about the possibility of salvation: "What good does it do me to work in the service of God? Because if I am predestined to death, I will never escape it; if, however, I act wickedly and am predestined to life, I will go to my eternal rest without a doubt."²³²

Hrabanus' characterization depicts Gottschalk as a dangerous fraud disrupting ecclesiastical order by encouraging disobedience to episcopal authority and a questioning of accepted teachings of salvation.²³³ By calling Gottschalk a wandering monk, Hrabanus used the image of the willful, disobedient monk to discredit Gottschalk's reputation as the devout and penitent figure he had cultivated for himself since the 830s. The term came from the Rule of Benedict, which recorded that *monachi gyrovagi* were the worst kind of monks, "slaves to their own wills and their stomachs."²³⁴ In the generations before Gottschalk's travels, rulers and legislators had been frequently concerned about wandering clerics, pilgrims, and monks. In 789, Charlemagne and his bishops discussed what to do about *monachi gyrovagi*, and wandering, fugitive, clerics and pilgrims in general, and ruled in the *Admonitio generalis* that traveling clerics and pilgrims were to be received by no one,

²³⁰ "Appendix ad Hrabanum," *MGH Epp.* V, p. 528: "Noticiam habuit (Rabanus) Hilduini, quem consultit in negotio suo cum Godeschalco." As in the case of the texts describing the events of 829 examined in Chapter 1, this is an early modern paraphrase.

²³¹ Hrabanus' letter to Hincmar, preserved in Hincmar, *Liber*, PL 125: 84–5, reprinted in *MGH Conc.* III, No. 16 [Mainz, 848], p. 184: "tales sint in hoc mundo quidam, qui propter praedestinationem dei, quae eos cogat in mortem ire, non possint ab errore et peccato se corrigere, quasi deus eos fecisset ab initio incorrigibiles esse et poenae obnoxios in interitum ire."

²³² Hrabanus' letter to Hincmar, in Hincmar, *Liber*, PL 125: 84–5, reprinted in *MGH Conc.* III, No. 16 [Mainz, 848], p. 184: "Quid mihi proderit laborare in servitio dei? Quia si praedestinatus sum ad mortem, nunquam illam evadam; si autem male egero et praedestinatus sum ad vitam, sine ulla dubitatione ad aeternam requiem vado."

²³³ Diem, "Verstoorder," pp. 122–6.

²³⁴ *La Règle*, 1, ed. de Vogüé et Neufville, pp. 436–40, here 440: "... propriis voluntatibus et guilae illecebris servientes..." On *gyrovagi* and the role of other monastic rules in creating this monastic anti-type, see Dietz, *Wandering Monks*, pp. 69–105; and Coon, *Dark Age Bodies*, pp. 77–9 and 112–13.

unless they were carrying letters of introduction from their bishop or abbot.²³⁵ They also ruled that wandering vagabonds, who traveled the land naked and in chains in a kind of self-imposed penance, should stay at home and perform whatever penance was canonically imposed on them.²³⁶ The issue of wandering clerics came up again in 813 at the Synod of Mainz, where it was ruled that those wandering without the supervision of a bishop or abbot should be remanded into custody, and if they refused to obey they should be taken to the archbishop in chains and judged at a synod.²³⁷

CONCLUSION

Gottschalk's remarkable run as a missionary and would-be reformer during the 830s and 840s came to a dramatic halt in 848 at the Synod of Mainz, where the bishops regarded his subversive strategies of debate and confrontational manner as proof that he posed a spiritual threat to the realm. The event of the synod shows the hierarchy's assertion of its traditional control of interpreting and disseminating doctrine in the Carolingian world. Because this control involved laying claim to ancient church tradition and patristic thought—an act that made rulers and their bishops the arbiters of imperial faith and practice—such authority was jealously guarded. Theology was state business, or politics on a cosmic scale, and “rogue” intellectuals usurping their authority with alternate claims to how God ordered the universe were unwelcome. While Hrabanus' enmity for Gottschalk and his personal efforts to stir up opposition against his former pupil were key to bringing about his conviction for heresy, the imperial machinery of control and correction in the form of the synod and its demand for priestly obedience quickly went into operation and Gottschalk was convicted and punished.

Yet the complex response to Gottschalk's preaching before the synod reveals several interesting things about the Carolingian church and society at that time. His public preaching of doctrine and confrontation of those refusing to accept his ideas seem to have taken church officials in Italy by surprise, though some such as Lupus of Chieti appear to have embraced his coming. Gottschalk's aggressive approach was new and produced no consensus among the clergy, who instead seem to have debated the question of grace not only with him but also among themselves—the very definition of controversy. Putting it in slightly different terms, the bishops

²³⁵ *Die Admonitio generalis Karls des Großen*, 3, ed. Hubert Mordek, Klaus Zechiel-Eckes and Michael Glathaar, *MGH Fontes iuris germanici antiqui in usum scholarum separatim editi* 16 (Hanover, 2012), p. 186; and *MGH Cap.* II, No. 23 [789], pp. 62–4, here 63. On this issue, see also Vogel, “Pèlerinage,” pp. 137–8 and de Jong, “Charlemagne's Church,” pp. 103–35. On the *admonitio generalis*, see *Die Admonitio*, ed. Mordek et al., pp. 1–160; McKitterick, *Frankish Church*, pp. 1–8; Brown, “Carolingian,” pp. 17–21; and Elisabeth Magnou-Nortier, “L'Admonitio generalis: étude critique,” in *Jornades Internacionals d'Estudi sobre el Bisbe Feliu d'Urgell, 28–30 de setembre de 1999. Crònica i estudis*, ed. Josep Perarnau (Barcelona, 2000), pp. 195–242.

²³⁶ *Die Admonitio generalis*, 77, ed. Mordek et al., p. 230.

²³⁷ *MGH Conc.* II, No. 36 [Mainz, 813], p. 267.

were unprepared to deal with Gottschalk's training, expertise, appeal, and unflagging confidence, suggesting that he was very rare as an outspoken theologian-priest.

In addition to his coercive methods of debate and his spiritual message that one could enact salvation (as seen in his hymn, *Christe rex regum*)—a combination that reveals Gottschalk to have been a significant figure in the history of Christian intellectual activity and affective piety—his doctrine impressed some and disturbed others as a forceful recasting of Augustine's later views on grace. The church father's prestige gave Gottschalk's arguments the authority he lacked without episcopal rank. The legacy and interpretation of Augustine, arguably the most revered church father in the Carolingian era, now became a central feature in the question of grace and salvation. The result was confusion and disorder as Gottschalk both won support and created opposition. It was unheard of in the Carolingian world to debate such theological questions outside of church councils and among the laity, but the fact that some clerics, monks, and lay people seem to have responded in his favor suggests that they were seeking new answers to questions raised by the violence and disorder accompanying the division of the empire. Whether they were convinced by Gottschalk's message or troubled by it, the open debate about grace and salvation was something new.

Gottschalk's activities also shed light on the relationship between mission, patronage, and support from the imperial elite and non-Christian leaders, and the changing political climate of the mid ninth century. Dynamic and compelling missionaries supported by powerful figures inside the empire and beyond its borders seem to have been regarded as essential to winning over converts and building the necessary socio-political networks to support the mission process, especially in the atmosphere of competition between the Carolingian and Byzantine spheres of influence. Gottschalk's talents made him an asset in this respect, and his particular style suggests that a missionary who could mingle with the powerful and the learned while showing a rugged self-reliance proved attractive to those parties associated with the imperial church's program of expansion. Gottschalk's case also suggests that it was on mission where some more radical ideas about Christianity could be espoused to potential converts far from watchful episcopal eyes, making the regime's concern that priests be properly trained and disciplined all the more understandable.

A Theologian-Martyr in 849

Gottschalk's condemnation was a transformative experience for him, an event after which he cast himself as a *persecuted*, but still faithful witness to divine truth. Following the Synod of Mainz, Gottschalk was returned to the Archdiocese of Rheims and held temporarily at the monastery of Orbais, where he had become a monk in the 830s. There he composed a long confessional text, his so-called *Confessio prolixior*, in order to prove his orthodoxy and, correspondingly, his status as one of the elect in the face of his conviction. No longer merely Christ's suffering client or one of the elect acting as a missionary of grace, now Gottschalk became in his own eyes a heroic, present-day theologian-martyr struggling against God's enemies like the ancient martyrs and church doctors. Gottschalk regarded his episcopal opponents at Mainz as heretics whose lies and errors must be avoided, while he likened himself to Augustine for correctly (thanks to divine inspiration) interpreting sacred mysteries as well as for defending the faith against heretical opponents. Appropriating the ancient martyr tradition, Gottschalk made the unheard of claim that he could miraculously survive deadly fiery trials in order to witness his faith and to prove the orthodoxy of his doctrine, framing his story of persecution and doctrinal conflict in the Frankish empire in terms of the church's ancient heroes in the Roman past.

This chapter also argues that Gottschalk sent his longer confession to Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims, hoping either to win him over to his position or to bring about another synod where he could prove his orthodoxy through argument and miraculous spectacle—in either case, Gottschalk would force Hincmar to reveal whether he was one of the elect like him or one of the reprobate like Hrabanus. Adopting Augustine's *Confessiones* as a textual model for the first time in history, Gottschalk framed his theological argument as a confession of faith, linking his resolute dissent, defense of his doctrine, and identification with the church father in a single artistic expression. In this way, Gottschalk continued to use subversive strategies to separate the elect from the reprobate after the Synod of Mainz, revealing how he incorporated his condemnation into a developing vision of his overall mission: persecution by the reprobate only made the divide between the "bodies" of Christ and Antichrist that much more evident.

When Hincmar convened the Synod of Quierzy in spring, 849, Gottschalk approached it as a forum for continuing his activities and was condemned a second time. Building on previous scholarship that has focused on the synod as a moment of episcopal authority in action, this chapter will also consider Gottschalk's efforts to provoke his judges who refused to accept his argument by denying them the

appropriate respect due to them as bishops, respect which he deemed they—like the bishops at the Synod of Mainz—as heretics did not deserve. This shocking act of defiance angered the abbots and bishops present and caused them to inflict on Gottschalk the harshest of punishments: he was stripped of his status as a priest, severely beaten, excommunicated, and incarcerated indefinitely at the monastery of Hautvillers under an imposed silence. Both Gottschalk's disturbing behavior at the synod and the bishops' severe response drew criticism from those who heard about the event later. Nevertheless, Gottschalk's success at Quierzy was that he hijacked the synod and transformed it into a stage on which to perform as the heroic, suffering theologian-martyr, while Hincmar found himself having to defend Gottschalk's treatment there during the 850s and 860s.

THEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT AS DIVINELY-INSPIRED CONFESSION

Gottschalk was sent to Hincmar by Hrabanus not long after the Synod of Mainz was concluded, and he was held at his former monastery of Orbais over the course of the winter.¹ Hincmar, who replaced the disgraced Archbishop Ebbo, was generally a close ally and advisor of Charles the Bald, but he remained a controversial figure throughout his reign for his involvement in numerous political and doctrinal struggles.² Gottschalk remained a thorny problem for the archbishop during the 850s and 860s, when he found support around Rheims from others resisting Hincmar's authority.³ Sensing how volatile the issue of Gottschalk and his teachings was, Hincmar decided during the winter of 848–9 to call another synod. Doubtlessly he hoped that either Gottschalk would recant, or that a canonical decision condemning him might prevent controversy from erupting in his archdiocese.

Yet Gottschalk was not idle during those winter months, and the evidence suggests that he began writing with the help of monks at Orbais in order to win over supporters before the synod. Hincmar indicated in late in 849 or early 850 that earlier he had received personally from Gottschalk “a little tome, small in size, but the greatest in impiety” (*thomulus quantitate parvus, sed impietate maximus*).⁴ While it is difficult to determine which of Gottschalk's works the archbishop knew with certainty,⁵ the text in question was most likely Gottschalk's so-called *Confessio*

¹ Flodoard, *Historia*, III, 21, ed. Stratmann, p. 280; and Genke, *Gottschalk*, p. 38.

² Schrörs, *Hincmar*; Devisse, *Hincmar*; Martina Stratmann, *Hincmar von Reims als Verwalter von Bistum und Kirchenprovinz* (Sigmaringen, 1991); ead., “Zur Wirkungsgeschichte Hinkmars von Reims,” *Francia* 22 (1995), pp. 1–43; and *Hincmar of Rheims*, ed. Stone and West.

³ Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 88–150; Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 115–53 and 187–280; Ganz, “Debate,” pp. 283–302; and Chazelle, *Crucified God*, pp. 165–208.

⁴ Hincmar, *Ad reclusos*, ed. Gundlach, pp. 261–2. See also Traube, *PLAC* III, p. 716; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 23–4; Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 133–4; and Dutton, *Politics*, pp. 131–2.

⁵ For previous arguments, see: Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 104–8; Traube, *PLAC* III, pp. 716–18; Mañeul Cappuyns, *Jean Scot Érigène: sa vie, son œuvre, sa pensée* (Brussels, 1969), pp. 102–10; and Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 130–5.

prolixior.⁶ Traube agreed with this assessment.⁷ Cappuyns and Devisse, however, thought that Hincmar meant his *Confessio brevior*, based on the fact that this particular text was so short as to take up a single page of parchment in the surviving codex; Devisse also suggested that the *Confessio prolixior* was instead a text Gottschalk wrote later and sent to Archbishop Amolo of Lyons.⁸ Yet it is most likely that Traube's position was correct. It is known that Hincmar forwarded a copy of the *Confessio prolixior* to Hrabanus, who attacked it in a letter from before Easter in 850, and to Eriugena who criticized it in his *De divina praedestinatione liber*.⁹ Likewise, Amolo seems not to have received a copy of the *Confessio prolixior* but instead a different text, since his response to Gottschalk contains criticism of the latter's neologism, "Hrabanians" (*Hrabanici*), a term that does not appear in the *Confessio prolixior*.¹⁰

That Hincmar might call Gottschalk's *Confessio prolixior* "greatest in impiety" is likely when one considers the work's purposes, which included: Gottschalk presenting himself as a divinely-inspired voice calling upon the elect to believe and confess twin predestination, establishing Augustine as a primary authority for his teachings, and claiming that he would miraculously survive a fiery ordeal at another synod to prove that his doctrine was orthodox. Gottschalk justified his past behavior, and especially his shocking defiance to the bishops at Mainz, by claiming that he embraced scandal in his struggle against heresy and that he willingly suffered hardship at their hands while refusing to please them for the sake of the truth because of the love he owed God.¹¹ He quoted Gregory the Great as an authority for this action: "However much we are able without sin we ought to avoid scandals among neighbors, but if scandal arises regarding the truth, it is more usefully permitted that scandal spring up than truth be abandoned."¹² Gottschalk's hope was that by presenting his doctrine in his own words and with the support of biblical and patristic authorities he would convince his audience of its orthodoxy and that his resistance was warranted, or he would force them to reveal themselves as members of the reprobate. To this end, the *Confessio* had a three-fold structure in support of these three objectives: an opening appeal to God and a confession of faith outlining specifically the doctrine of twin predestination; the "treatise" section of the *Confessio*, in which Gottschalk sought to "confess" the biblical and patristic evidence for his doctrine; and a final section of prayers for himself, his reader and

⁶ Gottschalk, *Confessio prolixior*, *CEG*, pp. 55–78. As noted in the introduction to this study, all manuscript copies of this text are lost, so our only witnesses are early modern printed editions.

⁷ Traube, "Carmina," pp. 715–16, esp. p. 716, n. 1.

⁸ Cappuyns, *Jean Scot*, pp. 106–7; and Devisse, *Hincmar*, p. 132.

⁹ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 43, *MGH Epp.* V, p. 488; Schrörs, *Hincmar*, p. 105; and Eriugena, *De divina praedestinatione liber*, 3, 7, ed. Goulven Madec, *CCCM* 50 (Turnhout, 1978), p. 26.

¹⁰ Amolo, *Epistola* 2, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 368–78, here pp. 371, 372, and 376.

¹¹ Gottschalk, *Confessio prolixior*, *CEG*, pp. 68–9.

¹² Gottschalk, *Confessio prolixior*, *CEG*, p. 68; and Gregory the Great, *Homiliae in Hiezechielem prophetam*, I, 7, 5, ed. Marcus Adriaen, *CCSL* 142 (Turnhout, 1971), p. 85: "In quantum sine peccato possumus, vitare proximorum scandalum debemus. Si autem de veritate scandalum sumitur, utilius permittitur nasci scandalum quam veritas relinquitur."

the church—including also his proposal for a ritual ordeal that would be the site of his miraculous spectacle.¹³

While Gottschalk drew from numerous patristic authorities, a central feature of the confession is his identification with Augustine—a striking example of how Gottschalk inserted his own experience into Christian antiquity.¹⁴ That Augustine had pride of place in Gottschalk's thought should not be surprising, since he had been defending his understanding of Augustine's theology for years: in northern Italy, in Eberhard's household years before, and in his *Libellus* at Mainz. As has been already discussed, identifying one's position with patristic authorities, as Gottschalk had been doing, was common in Carolingian doctrinal treatises, so in this sense his approach up to this point had not been unusual.¹⁵ In his *Confessio prolixior*, however, Gottschalk took things a step further by not only defending the church father's thought, but also by comparing himself to Augustine as one who taught twin predestination and fought against those who believed heretical doctrines. He portrayed Augustine as divinely inspired and among the greatest of the elect in the church, and likened himself to Augustine as God's special witness filled with grace. In this way, Gottschalk claimed that he was playing the same role Augustine had centuries before in the divine plan for the elects' salvation, which was to make known the truth of God's predestination. Yet Gottschalk departed from Augustine's teaching when he stressed that belief and confession of this doctrine were evidence of divine grace.¹⁶

The overall effect of Gottschalk's efforts to compare himself to the church father was that he recast Augustine as himself, an embattled witness of twin predestination. This portrayal of Augustine was crafted in an intellectual milieu where many others identified strongly with the church doctor. Pascal Boulhol notes that Claudius of Turin, who was engaged in a controversy about images in the 820s and who viewed Augustine as an iconoclast like himself, identified so thoroughly with Augustine that his opponent, Dungal, accused him of disregarding the other fathers.¹⁷ Philippe Le Maître argues that when examining the work of Hrabanus overall it is clear that he regarded Augustine as the master par excellence, which makes his defense of his understanding of the church father's thought in his treatise to Eberhard that much more significant.¹⁸

¹³ Gottschalk, *Confessio prolixior*, *CEG*, pp. 55–6, 56–71, and 71–8 respectively. Gumerlock, *Gottschalk*, pp. 74–96 divides the translation of this confession up into numerous sections to help the reader work through the text.

¹⁴ Other chief patristic authors include Gregory the Great, Isidore of Seville, Fulgentius, and Cassiodorus. See Gottschalk, *Confessio prolixior*, *CEG*, pp. 57–60, 63–70, and 73 for references, and Jenny Smith, "The Rebellious Monk Gottschalk of Orbais: Defining Heresy in a Medieval Debate on Predestination," *Eras* 17 (2015), pp. 1–24, here pp. 9–20 for a description of Gottschalk's non-Augustinian sources.

¹⁵ Otten, "Texture," pp. 3–50.

¹⁶ Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, pp. 76–7. Schrimpf, "Implikationen," pp. 169–70 and id., "Hraban und der Prädestinationsstreit des 9. Jahrhunderts," ed. Raymund Kottje and Harald Zimmermann, *Hrabanus Maurus: Lehrer, Abt und Bischof* (Mainz, 1982), pp. 145–53, here pp. 147–8, makes a similar argument, but also emphasizing that moral life was a sign of election.

¹⁷ Boulhol, *Claude*, pp. 191–200. See also Ganz, "Theology," pp. 775–6.

¹⁸ Philippe Le Maître, "Les méthodes exégétiques de Raban Maur," in *Haut Moyen Âge. Culture, éducation et société. Études offertes à Pierre Riché*, ed. Michel Sot (1990), pp. 343–51, here p. 349.

The defining of Augustine's doctrine on predestination and identifying with it was one of the chief features of the predestination debate that grew after Gottschalk's condemnation. Scholars besides Gottschalk and Hrabanus were deeply engaged in this process, which involved foremost responding to previous writers' positions. Eriugena, for instance, answered Gottschalk's doctrine of twin predestination with a highly controversial position that God was *unable* to predestine anyone to eternal punishment; he developed this argument from carefully-selected passages of Augustine's early writings, while ignoring his anti-Pelagian texts and other works which served as Gottschalk's chief authorities.¹⁹ Florus responded to the doctrines of Hrabanus, Hincmar, Gottschalk, and (especially) Eriugena, offering a very sophisticated doctrine that attempted to harmonize God's total control over the world with human mutability and responsibility.²⁰ Each author in the controversy presented a different interpretation of Augustine's thought, which necessarily involved an alternative image of the church father, and they urged their readers to accept it as authoritative.

These scholars and many others portrayed Augustine and his ideas in ways that suited their particular arguments and agendas. Like them Gottschalk used his interpretation of Augustine and his thought to distinguish himself sharply from opponents, whom he believed had failed to read or understand the church father's work correctly. What Gottschalk offered the readers of his *Confessio* was a bold reinterpretation of Augustine—one in which the church father confessed twin predestination and fought against those heretics denying its truth. Gottschalk's claims to speak for the church father were quite like Augustine's approach to the Apostle Paul, from whose Epistles he freely drew to make Paul "speak" on current controversies and pronounce authoritative opinions that supported Augustine's arguments—a rhetorical strategy described by Thomas Martin as Augustine's "Pauline voice."²¹ Since Gottschalk believed that success in the debate (as well as his former reputation) hung on the understanding of Augustine's thought, recasting the church father in these terms was meant to win over readers who also identified with Augustine.

One important aspect of Gottschalk's connection with Augustine was that he wrote his *Confessio prolixior* with particular devices drawn from the *Confessiones*.²² Like Augustine, Gottschalk adopted a scriptural style to speak to God directly and

¹⁹ Cappuyns, *Jean Scot*, especially pp. 111–14 and 317–21; Gangolf Schrimpf, "Der Beitrag des Johannes Scottus Eriugena zum Prädestinationsstreit," *Die Iren und Europa im früheren Mittelalter*, ed. Heinrich Löwe (Stuttgart, 1982), pp. 819–65; id., *Das Werk des Johannes Scottus Eriugena im Rahmen des Wissenschaftsverständnisses seiner Zeit* (Münster, 1982), pp. 72–131; John O'Meara, *Eriugena* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 32–50; Marenbon, "John Scottus," pp. 303–25; Zechiel-Eckes, *Florus*, pp. 90–118; and Robert Crouse, "Predestination, Human Freedom and Augustinian Theology of History in Eriugena's *De Divina Praedestinatione*," in *History and Eschatology in John Scot Eriugena and his Time*, ed. James McEvoy and Michael Dunne (Leuven, 2002), pp. 303–11.

²⁰ Ganz, "Debate," pp. 294–5; and Zechiel-Eckes, *Florus*, pp. 131–50.

²¹ Thomas Martin, "Vox Pauli: Augustine and the Claims to Speak for Paul. An Exploration of Rhetoric at the Service of Exegesis," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 8 (2000), pp. 237–72.

²² The scholarship on Augustine's *Confessiones* is extensive, but see especially the following studies: Pierre Courcelle, *Recherches sur les Confessions de saint Augustin* (Paris, 1950); id., *Confessions dans le tradition littéraire: Antecedents et postérité* (Paris, 1963); Brown, *Augustine*, pp. 151–75; Erich Feldman, "Confessiones," *Augustinus-Lexikon*, ed. Cornelius Mayer (Basel, 1986), pp. 1134–94; James O'Donnell,

with great emotion, frequently weaving biblical passages into his prayers. Schrörs made the comparison between the two works, writing that Gottschalk's style simply reflected his "unstable" personality: "The wild and pseudo-mystical character of the author, which made itself manifest here, stood out even stronger and in very crude colors in the longer confession of faith, which in imitation of the Augustine's *Confessions* has the form of a prayer directed to God."²³ Gottschalk's text comprises the first known prose imitation of Augustine's confessional style, though not, as Michel Banniard has noted, its autobiographical content.²⁴ Since it was aimed at refuting his opponents, Gottschalk's *Confessio prolixior* worked in a similar mode to Augustine's *Confessiones*, which was directed in part at answering his critics' accusations about his Manichaean past when he became bishop.²⁵

That Gottschalk knew Augustine's *Confessiones* and that it was a well-copied work in the ninth century cannot be disputed. Gottschalk cited it specifically in other works—"Augustinus . . . in libro confessionum" or "in libris confessionum"—as Pierre Courcelle noted in his monumental study of the church father's text.²⁶ Michael Gorman has demonstrated that sixteen manuscripts of the *Confessiones* survive from the ninth century, suggesting that there was a strong interest in the work among Gottschalk's contemporaries.²⁷ It also was not Gottschalk's only imitation of Augustine's work. Peter von Moos has argued that Gottschalk's poem, *O mi custos*, was written as an Augustinian confession, following the model of the church father's text.²⁸ In this poem, Gottschalk described himself as a repentant sinner mourning his crimes and as Lazarus dead in the tomb, seeking forgiveness and begging for God's grace—features common to his earlier hymns as was seen previously.

Whether Gottschalk could have expected his readers to identify these borrowed stylistic devices as Augustinian, however, is another question. As argued in Chapter 3, Augustine was increasingly seen as the most important church father in the ninth century, although the reception of his vast body of work and thought

Augustine: Confessions, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1992), edition and thorough commentary; and O'Donnell, *Augustine*, pp. 35–86.

²³ Schrörs, *Hincmar*, p. 106: "Der schwärmerische und pseudo-mystische Charakter des Verfassers, der hier sich ausspricht, tritt noch stärker und mit weit grelleren Farben in dem grösseren Glaubensbekenntnisse hervor, das in Nachahmung der "Bekenntnisse" Augustins die Form eines an Gott gerichteten Gebetes hat."

²⁴ Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, p. 45 who suggested that Gottschalk was working from an Augustinian "Vorbild," although he was not more specific; and Michel Banniard, "Vrais aveux et fausses confessions du IXe au XIe siècle vers une écriture autobiographique?" in *L'Aveu: Antiquité et Moyen-Âge. Actes de la table ronde organisée par l'École Française de Rome avec le concours du CNRS et de l'Université de Trieste, Rome 28–30 mars 1984* (Rome, 1986), pp. 215–41, here 220–4.

²⁵ O'Donnell, *Augustine*, pp. 35–86.

²⁶ Courcelle, *Les Confessions*, pp. 258–9 cited the references, although he made no comparison between Gottschalk's *Confessio prolixior* and Augustine's *Confessiones*. The references to Augustine's *Confessiones* in Gottschalk's works include: Gottschalk, *De trina deitate*, CEG, p. 89; id., *Responsa de diversis*, 6, CEG, p. 147; id., *Opusculum primum*, CEG, p. 368; and id., *Opusculum secundum*, 56, CEG, p. 475.

²⁷ Michael Gorman, "The Early Manuscript Tradition of St. Augustine's *Confessiones*," *Journal of Theological Studies* 34 (1983), pp. 114–45.

²⁸ Gottschalk, *O mi custos*, PLAC VI, pp. 89–97; and von Moos, "Gottschalks Gedicht," pp. 203–5.

was a complex process. While Gorman's manuscript evidence reveals that the *Confessiones* was being copied and presumably read in the ninth century, it does not appear to have been frequently quoted or discussed by Carolingian scholars like his more straightforward doctrinal writings. Eriugena and Florus cited the work, and short sections of it were used as individual prayers in the Ambrosian sacramentary and the *Libellus sacrarum precum* from Fleury-sur-Loire.²⁹ Otherwise, however, the *Confessiones* does not appear to have been generally regarded in the ninth century as Augustine's signature work as it would be in later centuries.³⁰ As will become evident, the only extant responses to Gottschalk's style in the *Confessio prolixior* are from his opponents, none of whom connected it with Augustine's work. Yet while his enemies failed to notice this more subtle layer of identification and comparison with Augustine, Gottschalk may have suspected that other readers—those whom he had known in the archdiocese of Rheims in the 830s and those who were privy to the creation of the work at Orbais—would identify it.

From the very beginning of the *Confessio prolixior*, Gottschalk stressed his unique role in revealing the truth of twin predestination. As in the confession in his *Libellus*, Gottschalk employed Paul's dictum (Romans 10, 10) that true belief and confession were key to salvation. His use of this Pauline language, as well as Moses' words from Exodus which begin the text, also helped him to portray himself as one revealing God's truth to the elect in a way reminiscent of these biblical forerunners:

"Ruler Lord," my "God," my "mercy," omnipotent and incomparably "clement" king [Ex 34, 6], enduring also with inestimable kindness the human race and deeply wise with uninvestigatable profundity, truly always all of your elect desire that they might be able to please you as if from yourself alone forever . . . Therefore I, a supplicant, invoke you—most powerful, most merciful and most glorious, triune and one Lord God—so that you might deign freely to be my most pious helper and listener and worthily grant me most needy (through the most unconquered power of your freely granted grace) to confess now also truly and simply "from my mouth to salvation," as I—from you through you and in you—believe now and have for a long time about your foreknowledge and predestination "in my heart to justice" [Ro 10, 10], thanks to you, and just as I have frequently confessed through your grace, in order that from my part at last unconquered and ceaselessly blessed truth might be laid open for your elect, and falsehood, conquered and by right utterly cursed, might now depart as is proper. Amen.³¹

²⁹ Courcelle, *Les Confessions*, pp. 254–5 and 260–2.

³⁰ Gorman, "Manuscript Traditions," pp. 381–412.

³¹ Gottschalk, *Confessio prolixior*, *CEG*, p. 55: "Dominator domine deus meus misericordia mea, rex omnipotens et incomparabiliter clemens, inaeestimabili quoque circa humanum genus benignitate patiens et investigabili penitus profunditate sapiens, cuius profecto sic semper indigent omnes electi tui quod videlicet tibi de te solo semper valeant placere . . . te igitur supplex invoco, cunctipotentissime clementissime et gloriosissime, trine et une domine deus ut gratis esse digneris piissimus adiutor et exauditor meus dignanterque largiaris indigentissimo mihi per gratuitae gratiae tuae invictissimam virtutem, ut quod ex te per te et in te de praescientia et praedestinatione tua jamdudum corde credo, tibi gratias, ad justitiam, sicuti jam crebro per gratiam tuam confessus sum nunc quoque veraciter atque simpliciter ore confitear ad salutem, quatenus tandem aliquando mea de parte patefiat electis tuis veritas invicta et sine fine benedicta, et facessat iam iamque sicut oportet falsitas devicta et prorsus jure maledicta. Amen."

It is clear from the prayer that Gottschalk saw himself not just as one of the elect, but as someone about to make known the truth for the rest of the *electi* so that falsehood would be conquered. The allusions to Exodus and Romans add a further layer to this characterization. To begin a prayer with the words “Dominator domine deus meus . . .” was to address God with the words Moses used when approaching God on the mountain to receive the commandments and to seek divine mercy for his people.³² Speaking Moses’ words enabled Gottschalk to place himself as one interceding on behalf of the elect as the lawgiver had done in the Book of Exodus. He claimed that his doctrine was revealed to him from God, much like the law had been revealed to Moses on the mountain. By following the apostle’s command to confess his faith and urging others to do the same, Gottschalk also gave his appeal a powerful Pauline resonance intended to move his readers.

The opening passage from Augustine’s *Confessiones*, translated below, reveals the same use of scriptural language and dramatic style of addressing God found in Gottschalk’s text:³³

“You are great, Lord, and most praiseworthy” [Ps 47, 2; Ps 95, 4; Ps 144, 3]: great is your virtue and there is no reckoning of your wisdom. Man, a part of your creation, wishes to praise you, and man “bearing around” his “mortality” [II Cor 4, 10], bears around the testimony of his sin and the testimony that “you resist the proud” [I Pt 5, 5]; and yet man, a part of your creation, wishes to praise you. You inspire him to love to praise you, because you made us for yourself and our heart is troubled until it remains in you. “Allow me,” Lord, to know and to “understand” [Ps 118, 34, 73, and 144] . . .³⁴

As in Gottschalk’s text, Augustine began by expressing the profound mystery of God’s relationship with humanity. It should be noted that both Augustine and Gottschalk in these very public texts adopted a scriptural “voice” from various biblical authors, as well as carefully chosen biblical language, in order to emphasize how their individual confession to God was inseparable from the divine truths expressed in scripture. In other words, confessing their theological arguments was meant to make their claims appear self-evidently true and as timeless as scripture itself. Since each author appealed to God’s divine judgment directly, the readers of the texts—whether sympathetic monks at Orbais or Archbishop Hincmar—were to regard themselves as merely witnesses to the truthful confession, rather than its judges.

³² Ex 34, 6–9. See also *Libellus trecensis*, ed. Wilmart, p. 11.

³³ Constantin Balmus, *Études sur le style de saint Augustin dans les Confessions et la Cité de Dieu* (Paris, 1930), which was unavailable at the time of writing; Courcelle, *Recherches*, pp. 291–310; Nicholas Wolterstorff, “God’s Speaking and Augustine’s Conversion,” in *Augustine’s Confessions: Critical Essays*, ed. William Mann (Oxford, 2006), pp. 161–74; and Philip Burton, *Language in the Confessions of Augustine* (Oxford, 2007), esp. pp. 112–32.

³⁴ Augustine, *Confessiones*, I, 1, ed. Lucas Verheijen, *CCSL* 27 (Turnhout, 1981), p. 1: “Magnus es, domine, et laudibilis valde: magna virtus tua et sapientiae tuae non est numerus. Et laudare te vult homo, aliqua portio creaturae tuae, et homo circumferens mortalitatem suam, circumferens testimonium peccati sui et testimonium, quia superbis resistis: et tamen laudare te vult homo, aliqua portio creaturae tuae. Tu excitas, ut laudare te delectet, quia fecisti nos ad te et inquietum est cor nostrum, donec requiescat in te. Da mihi, domine, scire et intelligere.”

Central to Gottschalk's purpose in writing the *Confessio prolixior* was to prove that Augustine had taught what Isidore later called twin predestination, a matter that took up the bulk of the second portion of his text.³⁵ This point was of the utmost importance to Gottschalk, for Hrabanus had maintained that *praedestinatio gemina* was Gottschalk's "superstition," or an ancient heresy long ago discredited, and not Augustine's doctrine. To make his case, Gottschalk assimilated passages from the church father's works in order to make Augustine's words speak his doctrine of twin predestination, as this passage demonstrates:

Let them hear, I say, here also Augustine wonderously speaking for himself, infused freely and abundantly enough with divine grace. He says: "But there is no one—not even one person—who did this good, which is to seek God, in that group of people predestined to destruction" [*De perfect. iust. hom.*, 13, 31]. Likewise speaking about the two cities: "Of which, he says, one which is predestined in eternity to rule with the Lord, the other to undergo eternal punishment with the devil" [*De civ. Dei*, 15, 1, 1]. Likewise: "If the church were so certain as to know who they are, who are predestined to go with the devil to eternal torment, but are still living, then it would not pray for them as it does not pray for the devil" [*De civ. Dei*, 21, 24, 1]. Likewise: "What will he give to those whom he has predestined to life, when he has already given these things to those, whom he predestined to death?" [*De civ. Dei*, 22, 24, 5]. Likewise in the *Enchiridion* about faith, hope and charity, which as an old man he wrote and published with the most subtle understanding, with the most honed skill, and the purest eloquence and most brilliant style, wonderously and uniquely for himself, with God's favor: "To their damnation," he said, "whom he justly predestined to punishment" [*Ench.*, 100]. Likewise in the same work: "They are called the sons of Gehenna not for coming from there but for being prepared for it, just as the sons of the kingdom are prepared for the kingdom" [*Ench.*, 39, 12]. What more evidence is required? What could be more sufficient? "Just as," he said, "the sons of the kingdom are prepared for the kingdom, so also are the sons of Gehenna prepared for it" [*Ench.*, 39, 12], for nothing at all exists save [what is] predestined.³⁶

³⁵ For his discussion of the term *praedestinatio gemina* as Isidorean, see Gottschalk, *Confessio prolixior*, CEG, p. 67. The reference is to Isidore of Seville, *Sententiae*, II, 6, 1, ed. Cazier, p. 103.

³⁶ Gottschalk, *Confessio prolixior*, CEG, pp. 64–5: "Audiant inquam hinc adhuc loquentem mirabiliter Augustinum per sibi gratis infusum satis ubertim charisma divinum. Hoc inquit bonum quod est requirere deum non erat qui faceret, non erat usque ad unum, sed in eo genere hominum quod praedestinatum est ad interitum. Item de duabus loquens civitatibus: Quarum est inquit una quae praedestinata est in aeternum regnare cum domino, altera aeternum supplicium subire cum diabolo. Item: Si de aliquibus ita certa esset ecclesia ut qui sint illi etiam nosset, qui licet adhuc in hac vita sint constituti, tamen praedestinati sunt in aeternum ignem ire cum diabolo, tam pro eis non oraret quam nec pro ipso. Item: Quid dabit his quos praedestinavit ad vitam, qui haec dedit etiam eis, quos praedestinavit ad mortem? Item in *Enchiridion* quod senex de fide spe et charitate, sensu subtilissimo, ingenio exercitatissimo, eloquio quoque purissimo styloque luculentissimo mirabiliter sibi ac singulariter, deo favente, conscripsit et edidit: Ad eorum inquit damnationem quos juste praedestinavit ad poenam. Item in eodem: dicuntur etiam filii gehennae non ex illa sed in illa praeparati, sicut filii regni praeparantur in regnum. Quid quaeretur evidentius? Quid sufficientius? Sicut inquit filii regni praeparantur in regnum, sic etiam filii gehennae in illam sunt praeparati, quod omnino nihil aliud est quam praedestinari." For the Augustinian quotations, many of which also appear in the *Confessio brevior*, see Augustine, *De perfectione*, 13, 31, ed. Charles Urba and Josef Zycha, CSEL 42 (Vienna, 1902), p. 32; id., *De civitate Dei*, XV, 1, 1; XXI, 24, 1; and XXII, 24, 5; ed. Dombart and Kalb, pp. 451, 789, and 851–2; and id., *Enchiridion*, 39 and 100, ed. Evans, pp. 72 and 103.

This barrage of Augustinian quotations focused on the church father's later teachings that the reprobate were predestined to eternal damnation, which was the chief issue of contention between Gottschalk and Hrabanus. It should also be noted that the last sentence is essentially a syllogism, since Gottschalk completes the thought with his own concluding point. Gottschalk intended this host of evidence from several of Augustine's works to convince his reader that his interpretation of the church father was correct, and modern scholars overall accept that his interpretation of Augustine's later position on grace was accurate.³⁷ Equally significant here is how Gottschalk claimed Augustine was divinely inspired when he wrote his doctrines, and he expressed exasperation with anyone who might dispute Augustine's great authority: "What more evidence is required? What could be more sufficient?" According to Gottschalk, the weight of the church father's pious and divinely-favored authority should be enough to convince anyone that twin predestination was orthodox. Indeed, Augustine's divine inspiration was comparable with Gottschalk's in the confession's opening passage.

Immediately after these quotations, Gottschalk analyzed the church father's techniques as a theologian, preacher, and reformer in order to compare himself to Augustine. Gottschalk emphasized how by divine inspiration the church father had "most diligently" (*diligentissime*) corrected his teachings by reviewing his own books, which enabled him to act boldly in the face of opposition: "He would not have spoken by your authority so often to the people fearlessly and also intrepidly; freely, willingly and openly; boldly and faithfully and joyfully—servile fear laid aside and filled with luminous love of you—if he had known there was something dangerous in his words."³⁸ Here the emphasis was as much on the church father's awareness of correct doctrine as on his heroic resilience as a preacher. For Gottschalk, Augustine's ability to throw aside "servile fear" much as his own ability to do so came from his love for God and divine authority itself, all of which had enabled the church father to preach confidently and even courageously, since he knew his teachings were free of error.

In this particular passage, we see especially how Gottschalk understood his own boldness and self-correction (rather than servilely accepting the heretical bishops' "correction") in equally heroic terms, and he discussed his concern for self-correction in this Augustinian fashion: "Indeed on which point, I now regard some issues more important [than before] and I have also deemed to add a few things here."³⁹ While we cannot tell how Gottschalk improved his work, since his earliest writing, the *Libellus*, survives only in fragments, this passage reveals that

³⁷ Freystedt, "Verurteilung," pp. 1–3 and 21; Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, pp. 29, 52–5, and 63–71; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 47–74; Mitterauer, *Gottschalk*, pp. 74–6; Epperlein, *Herrschaft*, pp. 197–8; Schrimpf, "Implikationen," p. 167; and Chazelle, *Crucified God*, pp. 167–81.

³⁸ Gottschalk, *Confessio prolixior*, CEG, p. 65: "... nec inde prorsus tam frequenter ad populum impavide simul et intrepide, licenter libenter ac libere, fidenter ac fiducialiter ac gaudenter, servili postposito timore luminosque tui perfusus amore tua auctoritate locutus fuisset, si quid itidem periculi inesse cognovisset."

³⁹ Gottschalk, *Confessio prolixior*, CEG, p. 65: "Unde quidem nonnulla iam superius posui et pauca hic etiam subicienda censui."

Gottschalk wanted to point out very specifically that he—like the church father—had made necessary corrections to his doctrine.

Having confessed his belief in twin predestination and demonstrated that Augustine taught this same doctrine, Gottschalk offered a series of prayers in the last section of the *Confessio*. Here he was acting as a divinely inspired intercessor for the elect. He asked God to transform his “impudent, obstinate and stubborn” (*procaces pertinaces atque pervicaces*) and “combative, treacherous and deceitful” (*pugnaces fallaces atque mendaces*) opponents into “simple lovers of truth” (*simplices veritatis amatores*).⁴⁰ He also prayed for God to protect the church from his heretical enemies, whom, he stressed, were liars about divine truth and clearly among the reprobate.⁴¹ Gottschalk spoke here with a voice of authority on the one hand, as one piously “inspired, animated and armed” (*afflatus animatus armatus*) by God, but still humbly aware on the other that his ability to do so was thanks to divine mercy alone.⁴² His confession was a sign of divine election and that he was free from the perversion of heresy. Gottschalk also claimed that—like Augustine—he opposed anything he heard contrary to the truth and denounced it as heretical, although here Gottschalk was actually citing Fulgentius’ *De fide ad Petrum*, a short work written to a friend on the rules of faith.⁴³ Gottschalk, while generally accurate in his knowledge of Augustine’s and Fulgentius’ texts, here (as in the case of the *Hypomnesticon* before) revealed that his view of Augustine was a construction based on some false assumptions.

By comparing himself to the divinely-inspired Augustine, Gottschalk claimed a preeminence that distinguished him from his contemporaries as the voice of God’s revelation for his time as the church father had been in his own era. Like Augustine, Gottschalk fought against heresy and sought to defend the truth of twin predestination against the errors being spread by his opponents. Gottschalk wanted his readers to know that he was not a heretic to be despised and mistreated as he had been at Mainz, but an authority of the greatest and most humble kind—a divinely-inspired one—who was revealing to them the salvific truth about grace.

THE MIRACLES OF A SELF-PROCLAIMED MARTYR

The public nature of Gottschalk’s confession before God, the divine judge, as well as his presentation of textual evidence and prayers to free the church from heresy were meant to impress the readers that he had been wrongfully condemned and punished. Yet Gottschalk also claimed that he could offer further evidence to prove his case conclusively: he would undergo a deadly trial (*examen*) in order to give

⁴⁰ Gottschalk, *Confessio prolixior*, *CEG*, p. 72.

⁴¹ Gottschalk, *Confessio prolixior*, *CEG*, p. 73.

⁴² Gottschalk, *Confessio prolixior*, *CEG*, pp. 73 and 76.

⁴³ Fulgentius, *De fide ad Petrum*, 87, ed. Fraipont, *CCSL* 91A (Turnhout, 1968), pp. 711–60, here 760.

witness to his own election and the orthodoxy of twin predestination. Here Gottschalk linked individual confession and theological argument with judicial ordeal and the recreation of an ancient miraculous spectacle in a request for divine intervention that would enable him—much like the ancient martyrs centuries before—to witness his faith in a time of persecution.

Gottschalk's experiences at the Synod of Mainz—what he regarded as his wrongful condemnation, his divinely-inspired refusal to recant, and his bodily punishment—provided him with evidence that he was a persecuted martyr. Now Gottschalk sought to link his status as a suffering martyr with the common practice of judicial ordeals to present irrefutable truth that his doctrine was correct. By blending theological argument with a request for divine aid in a judicial test, Gottschalk sought to assert that his claim of truth was beyond the bounds of his opponents' authority: they had failed to judge him correctly because they were heretics, and therefore Gottschalk intended to place his case in God's hands directly. Suggesting another synod as the setting for his proposed *examen*, Gottschalk made it clear that he wanted to overturn the episcopal decision in a similar ecclesiastical forum, although this time in a spectacle of divine truth and power on earth:

And would that it should please you, most powerful and equally most clement Lord, that just as I believe and hope in you—as you deigned a long time ago and you deign now to bestow on me freely to desire and to do every day—grant to me before the multitude of the people fearing you and gathered from everywhere, and the prince of this realm with the venerable body of pontiffs, priests, monks and canons (if they do not wish otherwise to accept this truth of the catholic faith about your predestination), that I will declare by your favoring grace that I will assent to a test before all looking on, so that after four barrels have been placed one after another and filled one by one with boiling water, oil, lard and pitch and at last a most copious fire has been lit for me, and having called upon your most glorious name to prove this my faith, indeed the catholic faith, grant that I might enter into each barrel and thus pass through each—you coming before, accompanying me, offering your right hand and mercifully leading me out—until I come out unharmed so that at last the clarity of the catholic faith should shine out in your church and everywhere and falsehood vanish—thus faith be asserted and perfidy be avoided.⁴⁴

⁴⁴ Gottschalk, *Confessio prolixior*, CEG, pp. 74–5: "Atque utinam placeret tibi cunctipotentissime pariter ac clementissime domine ut sicut in te credo et spero, dato mihi gratis posse prout iam dudum dare dignatus es et dare quotidie dignaris etiam velle, coram undique collecta populorum te timentium multitudine, praesente etiam istius regni principe [simul] cum pontificum et sacerdotum monachorumque seu canonicorum venerabili simul agmine, concederetur mihi, si secus hanc catholicae fidei de praedestinatione tua veritatem nollent recipere, ut isto quod dicturus sum favente tua gratia id adprobarem cernentibus cunctis examine, ut videlicet quatuor doliis uno post unum positis atque ferventi singillatim repletis aqua oleo pingui et pice et ad ultimum accenso copiosissimo igne liceret mihi, invocato gloriosissimo nomine tuo, ad approbandam hanc fidem meam immo fidem catholicam, in singula introire et ita per singula transire donec, te praeveniente comitante ac subsequente dexteramque praebente ac clementer educente, valerem sospes exire quatenus in ecclesia tua tandem aliquando catholicae hinc fidei claritas claresceret et falsitas evanesceret fidesque firmaretur et perfidia vitaretur."

Gottschalk's assumption of the voice of martyrdom here was utterly remarkable in the ninth century at a time when the cult of the ancient martyr heroes was growing dramatically.⁴⁵ The Carolingian world was certainly not averse to requesting divine aid. The liturgy, for example, contained frequent invocations for God to aid rulers and their armies against enemy forces.⁴⁶ Yet other texts like Gottschalk's, in which ninth-century authors prayed to be able to *perform* a miracle, simply do not exist. Schrörs saw Gottschalk's proposed trial as evidence of his "madness," while others have regarded it as illustrative of his determination or even obstinacy that his teachings were orthodox.⁴⁷ Schrimpf convincingly argues that Gottschalk persisted in his belief of twin predestination in order to reveal that he was one of the elect, although he does not refer specifically to the trial.⁴⁸ Gottschalk's willingness to undergo such an *examen* suggests that he was ready to risk his life, yet his imagined trial involved much more than obstinacy or a willingness to die for what he believed was the truth.

Gottschalk's test was not a typical ecclesiastical "iudicium dei," in which the fire would be expected to injure him and his veracity would be discovered with the healing of his wounds. Many kinds of trials by ordeal were employed in the ninth century, and each involved some act of physical endurance and suffering that was meant to reveal whether a person accused of a crime was innocent or guilty. Common examples included placing one's hand in boiling water, holding a red-hot iron, walking on hot ploughshares, being submerged in cold water, eating blessed bread and cheese (for clerics suspected of theft) to see if the person could swallow it, and (for the clergy) holding one's arms outstretched as if one were crucified in an act of spiritual and physical endurance.⁴⁹ When, in the case of boiling water or a red-hot iron, the person's own hand (or that of his or her ordeal-taker) healed afterwards, then the person was found innocent. The most famous ninth-century example of such a trial was the case of Lothar II's divorce of his wife Theutberga. In this case, Lothar sought to divorce his wife on the grounds of an alleged incestuous relationship Theutberga had with her brother, seeking to marry

⁴⁵ Felice Lifshitz, *The Name of the Saint: The Martyrology of Jerome and Access to the Sacred in Francia, 627–827* (Notre Dame, 2006), passim but esp. pp. 4–7, 50–3, 64–5, 75–6, 80–1, 130–1, and 133–40; and Henri Quentin, *Les martyrologes historiques du Moyen Âge: étude sur la formation du martyrologe romain*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1908), esp. pp. 1–16.

⁴⁶ Michael McCormick, "The Liturgy of War in the Early Middle Ages: Crises, Litanies and the Carolingian Monarchy," *Viator* 15 (1984), pp. 1–23.

⁴⁷ Schrörs, *Hincmar*, p. 107; Traube, "Carmina," pp. 715–16; Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, pp. 45–6; and Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 49–51.

⁴⁸ Schrimpf, "Implikationen," pp. 169–70.

⁴⁹ The *formulae* for the ordeals are edited in "Ordines iudiciorum Dei," ed. Karl Zeumer, *MGH Legum V* (Hanover, 1886), pp. 599–708. For scholarship on ordeals, see: Adalbert Erler, "Der Ursprung der Gottesurteile," *Paideuma. Mitteilungen zur Kulturkunde* 2 (1941), pp. 44–65; Charlotte Leitmaier, *Die Kirche und die Gottesurteile* (Vienna, 1953); Hermann Nottarp, *Gottesurteilstudien* (Munich, 1956); Robert Bartlett, *Trial by Fire and Water: The Medieval Judicial Ordeal* (Oxford, 1986), esp. pp. 1–33; Dominique Barthélemy, "Présence de l'aveu dans le déroulement des ordalies (IXe–XIIIe siècle)," in *L'Aveu: Antiquité et Moyen Âge* (Rome, 1986), pp. 191–214; id., "Diversité des ordalies médiévales," *Revue historique* 280 (1988), pp. 3–26; and Sarah Keefer, "Ut in omnibus honorificetur Deus: the *corsnæd* ordeal in Anglo-Saxon England," in *The Community, the Family and the Saint: Patterns of Power in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. Joyce Hill and Mary Swan (Turnhout, 1998), pp. 237–64.

his mistress who had already given him offspring; Theutberga, however, refused the divorce and one of her retainers successfully underwent a trial by boiling water to prove that she was innocent of the charges.⁵⁰ Hincmar supported this ordeal, writing a lengthy treatise on the matter and revealing that he was not against ordeals in principle.⁵¹

Yet Gottschalk's concept for his ordeal was extremely elaborate and meant to replicate a particular kind of test, since it was a proof of faith and innocence of heresy he sought to make.⁵² He did not foresee any need to heal after the flames had harmed his body—as in the case of the typical ninth-century ordeals—but instead to prove his doctrine by being preserved from the danger by God. In fact, he believed that God's grace in the form of his right hand would protect him from the flames totally. Indeed, Gottschalk's combination of confession and ordeal were meant to reveal his inner quality, or "the privacy of the heart" where truth was hidden, as Abigail Firey has argued in Theutberga's case.⁵³ Gottschalk claimed that his actions, made possible by divine grace as in the case of the ancient martyrs, would miraculously reveal the truth of his belief and fidelity, proving him to be a vessel of divine grace and an authority on orthodoxy.

Gottschalk's choice of four materials—water, oil, lard, and pitch—was unparalleled, and although fire was a common element in other ordeals, Gottschalk intended to place his entire body *within* the boiling liquids one after another. The tales of the martyrs offer many accounts of saints being tortured in boiling liquids, but Gottschalk did not wish to die from his ordeal as they generally did.⁵⁴ One account, however, that of Crispin and Crispinian, seems to offer striking similarities to Gottschalk's proposal.⁵⁵ Saints Crispin and Crispinian were martyred in Rome during Diocletian's reign in 285, but by the sixth century their relics had been translated to Soissons, where, according to Gregory of Tours, a basilica was built for them and they were venerated.⁵⁶ The so-called Jerome *Martyrologium* associated them with Soissons, although it did not indicate that they were martyred there.⁵⁷ Later Frankish accounts, however, related how the two were martyred in Soissons, although they disagreed about the types of tortures

⁵⁰ Karl Heidecker, *The Divorce of Lothar II: Christian Marriage and Political Power in the Carolingian World*, trans. Tanis Guest (Ithaca, 2010), pp. 63–99; Firey, *A Contrite Heart*, pp. 42–52; and Bartlett, *Trial by Fire*, pp. 13–14.

⁵¹ Hincmar, *De divortio Lotharii regis et Theutbergae reginae*, MGH Conc. IV, Supp. I, ed. Letha Böhringer (Hanover, 1992); Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 175–205; and Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 386–95.

⁵² Bartlett, *Trial by Fire*, pp. 20–1 records Gottschalk's trial along with another *examen* from Gregory of Tours as evidence of early medieval ordeals meant to prove faith, although he provides no documentation for the latter.

⁵³ Firey, *A Contrite Heart*, pp. 42–52.

⁵⁴ Castelli, *Martyrdom and Memory*, esp. pp. 33–68; Gaddis, *There is No Crime*, pp. 29–67; and Brown, *The Cult of Saints*, p. 79.

⁵⁵ *Vitae Crispini et Crispiniani*, *Acta Sanctorum*, October 11 (Brussels, 1864), pp. 495–540.

⁵⁶ Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum*, V, 34 and IX, 9, ed. Bruno Krusch and Wilhelm Levison, MGH SSRM I (Hanover, 1965), pp. and 240–1 and 423; Duchesne, *Fastes*, pp. 141–52; L. Jullian, "Le cycle de Rectarianus," *Revue des études anciennes* 25 (1923), pp. 367–78; Hippolyte Delchaye, *Études sur légendier romain* (Brussels, 1936), pp. 126–9.

⁵⁷ Pseudo-Jerome, *Martyrologium*, PL 30: 437–86, here 480, on which see Lifshitz, *The Name of the Saint*.

they endured. The Lyons recension (before 806) of Bede's *Martyrologium* recorded that they were stretched on the rack, beaten, and whipped before being killed by the sword.⁵⁸ A collection of saints' passions probably created at St-Médard in Soissons during the 780s–90s, as well as Hrabanus's own martyrology from the 840s, recorded that Crispin and Crispinian were persecuted by the prefect Rictiovarus under orders from Emperor Maximian. Among the tortures they endured, according to both texts, was the following account of boiling liquids, which matches Gottschalk's proposed ordeal with its life-saving miracle:

For [Rictiovarus] ordered pitch, lard and oil to be boiled simultaneously, and again ordered the holy martyrs to be cast into it, as if commanding them to be consumed by the punishment. But when his obedient officers completed everything that had been ordered by the wicked man, the holy martyrs immovably relying on their faith, quickly and faithfully said to God in a prayer: "You are able, our Lord God, to free us from the torments inflicted by this wicked man, and just as you wished that we should suffer for the confession of your holy name, so lead [us] out unharmed from even this punishment also for the confusion of the devil and his minions." Soon after the prayer was completed the angel of the Lord led them from the fire without harm.⁵⁹

The similarity between the account and Gottschalk's ordeal is extraordinary. Gottschalk could have learned this story when living around Soissons in the early 830s or while he was being held at Orbais. The story could have inspired his hopes for a miracle, and living near Soissons himself he might have hoped that God would repeat it to reveal to the elect that the bishops at Mainz were wrong when they condemned him and his doctrine. Gottschalk's claims to miraculous powers and martyrdom happened at a time when the cult of martyrs was being embraced throughout the Frankish world as martyrologies spread in popularity.⁶⁰ Whether

⁵⁸ Bede, *Martyrologium*, PL 94: 799–1148, here 1081; *Edition pratique des Martyrologes de Bede de l'anonyme lyonnais et de Florus*, ed. Jacques Dubois and Geneviève Renaud (Paris, 1976), p. 194.

⁵⁹ The texts in both martyrologies are nearly identical. See *Passio Crispini et Crispiniani*, BHL 1900, ed. Michèle Gaillard, in *Le légendier de Turin. MS. D.V.3 de la Bibliothèque Nationale Universitaire*, ed. Monique Goullet with Sandra Isetta (Florence, 2014), pp. 311–21, here pp. 317–18, and Hrabanus, *Martyrologium*, ed. John McCulloh, CCCM 44 (Turnhout, 1979), p. 108 (here I have followed McCulloh's punctuation and orthography): "Nam picem, adipem, oleumque simul iussit fervere, et sanctos denuo martyres in eam praecipitari quasi consummendos poena praecepit. At ubi ministri obtemperantes perfecerunt cuncta, quae sibi ab impio fuerunt imperata, sancti martyres spei suae immobiliter incumbentes, alacres fiducialiter deo in oratione dixerunt: 'Potens es, domine deus noster, de inlatis nos ab impio liberare tormentis, et sicut nos voluisti pro confessione tui sancti nominis pati, ita ad confusionem diaboli et satellitum eius ab hac etiam poena inlaesos educere.' Mox oratione finita eduxit eos angelus domini sine dolore ab igne." On the Soissons text, see: Guy Philippart, "Les légendiers, des origines au début du ix^e siècle," in *Le légendier de Turin. MS. D.V.3 de la Bibliothèque Nationale Universitaire*, ed. Monique Goullet with Sandra Isetta (Florence, 2014), pp. 7–74; and David Ganz and Monique Goullet, "Le Légendier de Turin et l'écriture AB," in *Le légendier de Turin. MS. D.V.3 de la Bibliothèque Nationale Universitaire*, ed. Monique Goullet with Sandra Isetta (Florence, 2014), pp. 75–91. On Hrabanus's text, see: John McCulloh, "Das Martyrologium Hrabanus als Zeugnis seiner geistigen Arbeit," in *Hrabanus Maurus: Lehrer, Abt und Bischof*, ed. Raymund Kottje and Harald Zimmermann (Mainz, 1982), pp. 154–64. Special thanks to Reader C for the Soissons citation.

⁶⁰ Lifshitz, *The Name of the Saint*, pp. 4–7, 50–3, 64–5, 75–6, 80–1, 130–1, and 133–40; and Quentin, *Les martyrologes*, pp. 1–16.

Gottschalk saw himself as another Crispin or Crispinian, he seems to have understood himself similarly as a suffering and persecuted witness for God's truth who as a member of the elect could pray for the faithful and request a miracle for his own fidelity in their tradition.

It is unclear how readers would have responded to this proposed ordeal. Gottschalk is the only known person to claim for himself miraculous powers in the Carolingian era, a period when holiness and divine favor were generally regarded as the hierarchy's carefully-guarded purview.⁶¹ To fellow members of the diocese of Soissons, Gottschalk's *examen* must have looked strikingly similar to the local martyr tale of Crispin and Crispinian. The brothers at Orbais, perhaps inclined to see Gottschalk as unjustly condemned and punished at Mainz, could have viewed his self-representation as a martyr as fitting. They would have heard about his suffering when he arrived at Orbais, could have listened to his evidence about Augustine's teaching of twin predestination, and might have been convinced that he had endured terrible punishment without abandoning his faith. In this way, Gottschalk's proposed ordeal was a challenge to Hrabanus and the bishops at the Synod of Mainz: while Gottschalk had suffered under their injustice there, he declared that he would survive even greater dangers at another synod through divine intervention.

Whether Gottschalk imagined that Hincmar would actually allow him to perform this ordeal at another synod is difficult to say. Gottschalk could certainly have believed that he would survive such an ordeal. Ninth-century readers of martyr stories did not doubt their veracity, and Gottschalk's *Confessio prolixior* demonstrates how he believed that God had placed him in a similar situation to those of the martyrs. Indeed, the ordeal allowed Gottschalk to cast himself very clearly as a martyr, a witness to divine truth, in a way that his readers at Orbais and Hincmar himself might recognize. Yet the archbishop, who described the text as "the greatest in impiety," did not see it in the same terms and instead regarded it as further proof of his pride and sinfulness—an appraisal Hrabanus would share in a letter from 850, when he viewed Gottschalk's ordeal as further evidence of heretical pride and obstinacy in contrast with the humility of the three boys cast into the fiery furnace in the Book of Daniel.⁶² Eriugena claimed Gottschalk's "madness" (*dementiae*) and "heresy" (*error*) justified such a trial, though he anticipated quite a different outcome: "Indeed, you deserve to burn in oil and pitch, since you did not fear perversely to teach the light of charity and the mystery of predestination."⁶³

Gottschalk ended his *confessio* with a request to his reader—the only portion of the text not directed at God—that he might pray for its author and share in sincere charity, while joining the struggle against his heretical enemies, steadfast in the confession of the true faith. Gottschalk claimed that he confessed twin

⁶¹ Fouracre, "The Origins of the Carolingian Attempt," pp. 161–5; Garrison, "The Franks as the New Israel," pp. 114–61; and Garipzanov, *The Symbolic Language*, passim but esp. pp. 39–41.

⁶² Hrabanus, *Epistola* 44, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 498–9.

⁶³ Eriugena, *Liber*, 3, ed. Madec, pp. 25–6 with the quotation on p. 26: "Merito quippe in oleo atque pice ardere debuisti, qui et lumen caritatis et mysterium praedestinationis perperam docere non timuisti."

predestination because of the debt of charity: he did so out of love for God and his neighbor—echoing his concern for charity in his letter to Bishop Lupus.⁶⁴ His efforts to bring his contemporaries to the true faith were, therefore, a work of love. Yet he also asked for fatherly and fraternal love from his reader and made a jab at Hrabanus with a pun on his name, which means “raven” in German (although he used the Latin word (*corvus*) in his text). He asked his reader to approach his appeal not with “raven-like envy” (*livore corvino*) but with “dove-like love” (*amore columbino*).⁶⁵ It seems likely that Gottschalk hoped Hincmar and other readers—overwhelmed by his arguments, his proposal for an ordeal, and now by seeing that his motivation was charity for any other members of the elect—would accept his doctrine and abandon Hrabanus’ heresy thanks to God’s grace. Gottschalk asked his reader to pray that he would always have “true humility,” which meant to him that he would remain steadfast in his faith in grace, and “sincere charity,” which referred to his willingness to share the revelation of his doctrine to others.⁶⁶ Here again is the important intersection of prayer and grace for Gottschalk: prayer from the elect could lead to the distribution of divine grace. Gottschalk continued to illustrate this relationship by praying—as one of the elect—with reference again to Paul’s formula of believing and confessing that his reader would receive God’s grace and accept his confession as the true faith.⁶⁷ Here Gottschalk revealed the ostensible, “fashioned” purpose of the confession: his reader—whether a “fatherly” figure like Hincmar or a monastic brother—would either embrace his faith by God’s grace and thereby be revealed also as one of God’s elect, or recoil from it as one of the reprobate. In either case, Gottschalk’s goal to divide the elect from the reprobate in his own time would be furthered.

SYNOD OF QUIERZY (849)

Approximately six months after his condemnation at Mainz, Gottschalk was tried a second time at the Synod of Quierzy.⁶⁸ There gathered King Charles the Bald, the bishops of the Archdiocese of Rheims, and the abbots of Corbie, Hautvillers, and Orbais. The preceding Synod of Mainz served as a model for Quierzy and Hrabanus’ characterization of Gottschalk as dangerous was accepted as authoritative. Gottschalk was questioned about his teachings and defended his position, but then exploded in abuse against those present—including the bishops—when he found that they revealed (in his eyes) their heresy by scorning his doctrine of predestination. While Gottschalk may have anticipated that there would be some support among the bishops at Quierzy since he had originally taught a version of his doctrine there in the 830s, his goal overall seems to have been to incite controversy

⁶⁴ Gottschalk, *Confessio proluxior*, *CEG*, p. 77.

⁶⁵ Gottschalk, *Confessio proluxior*, *CEG*, pp. 76–7.

⁶⁶ Gottschalk, *Confessio proluxior*, *CEG*, pp. 76–7.

⁶⁷ Gottschalk, *Confessio proluxior*, *CEG*, p. 78.

⁶⁸ *MGH Conc.* III, No. 18 [Quierzy, 849], p. 194.

by refusing to respect the bishops or to accept their correction in an act of righteous defiance. In this fashion, he could identify whether any of the bishops there were actually to be counted among the elect rather than the reprobate, while simultaneously playing the role of the persecuted martyr in the face of the synod's heresy. The response of the bishops was severe: he was stripped of his priestly honor, severely flogged, forced to burn some of his own writings, and then sent off to imprisonment at the monastery of Hautvillers where he was confined to the stronghouse (*ergastulum*) in a state of imposed silence.⁶⁹

With the exception of a single anecdote recorded in a later text, Gottschalk did not give an account of the synod in his writings, and—as in the case of the Synod of Mainz—we must rely for the most part on accounts left by an adversary, Hincmar, to reconstruct the events. Hincmar left four different narratives of the trial: an interpolation in the *Annales Bertiniani*, an account preserved by Florus in his *Libellus de tribus epistolis*, a letter to Pope Nicholas I, and a chapter of his *Liber de praedestinatione*.⁷⁰ Hincmar also preserved the only surviving source from the trial, Gottschalk's sentence, in his *Ad reclusos*.⁷¹ In each case, the archbishop's chief concerns were on the one hand to prove that Gottschalk's teachings were heretical and his behavior at the synod was reprehensible, and on the other to defend the council's proceedings and its condemnation of Gottschalk as canonical.⁷² These Hincmarian sources, therefore, reveal important clues about how the bishops and abbots came to condemn Gottschalk, and what cultural assumptions influenced their decision to impose upon him the most severe punishment ever suffered by a Carolingian theologian.

Hincmar's account in the *Annales* relates that Gottschalk had been “dishonorably thrown out” (*turpiter eiectus*) of Italy, “exposed and convicted” (*detectus atque convictus*) at the Synod of Mainz for his superstitious and pestiferous teachings about predestination, and then sent to Hincmar of Rheims to be punished in a way worthy of his “faithlessness” (*perfidia*)—all of which indicates how the decision at Mainz fundamentally influenced the proceedings and outcome at Quierzy.⁷³ Hincmar's account also reveals that Gottschalk was “publicly whipped and compelled to burn the books of his own assertions in the fire.”⁷⁴ Based on this passage alone, one would gather that no trial took place at all: Gottschalk, a condemned and

⁶⁹ Freystedt, “Urteilung,” pp. 7–17; Traube, *PLAC* III, pp. 713–14; Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, pp. 41–3; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 22–3; Epperlein, *Herrschaft*, p. 233; Devisse, *Hincmar*, p. 127; Ganz, “Predestination,” pp. 287–8; and Diem, “Verstoorder,” 125–30.

⁷⁰ *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 849, ed. Grat et al., pp. 56–7 (on which see *The Annals*, trans. Nelson, pp. 14–15); Florus, *Libellus de tribus epistolis*, ed. Klaus Zechiel-Eckes, *CCCM* 260 (Turnhout, 2014), esp. pp. 320–2 and 366–70, including some of Florus' criticisms; Hincmar, *Epistola* 169, *MGH Epp.* VIII, pp. 144–63, here 160–1; and Hincmar, *Liber*, 2, *PL* 125: 84–6.

⁷¹ Hincmar, *Ad reclusos*, ed. Gundlach, pp. 308–9, reprinted with discussion of manuscripts in *MGH Conc.* III, No. 18 [Quierzy, 849], pp. 197–9. This text is discussed further in Chapter 5.

⁷² Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 108–26; Traube, *PLAC* III, pp. 715–16; Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 127–9 and 132–47, who claimed that the interpolation in the annals did not belong to Hincmar; Ganz, “Debate,” pp. 288–9 and 299–300; and Chazelle, *Crucified God*, pp. 181–95.

⁷³ *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 849, ed. Grat et al., pp. 56–7.

⁷⁴ *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 849, ed. Grat et al., p. 57: “publice flagellatus librosque suarum adsertionum igni cremare compulsus est.”

infamous heretic, was simply brought before the synod and punished. The Synod of Mainz, under Louis the German's auspices, had condemned him, and the Synod of Quierzy, led by Charles the Bald and Hincmar, had punished him. Hincmar demonstrated that the decision of Mainz was viewed as authoritative by Charles the Bald and his bishops. Influenced by Hrabanus' depictions of Gottschalk, Hincmar described how the bishops regarded Gottschalk's tremendous "knowledge" (*scientia*), here meaning his patristic learning, as a source of pride that made him "puffed up" (*tumidus*), which led him to fabricate his own "superstitions" about predestination.⁷⁵

In his *Libellus de tribus epistolis*, Florus of Lyons preserved the second of Hincmar's accounts, which is of particular significance since it gives a sense of how the bishops interacted with Gottschalk. This account reveals that the severity of Gottschalk's punishment was based mostly on their reaction to his aggressive defense of his doctrine, and to his disdain for those who disagreed with him. According to Florus, Hincmar wrote that before the gathering of bishops Gottschalk answered questions about his teachings and spoke on his own about them, but then broke out in abuse against those present when they refused to agree with his teachings.⁷⁶ Florus also tells us that Gottschalk had a *libellus* of biblical and patristic authorities at Quierzy with which he intended to prove the orthodoxy of his teachings to the synod.⁷⁷ The text may have been the very same *Libellus* he had at Mainz or his *Confessio prolixior*.

Instead of accepting his arguments, however, Gottschalk discovered that the bishops were merely interested in determining whether or not he persisted in his wrong beliefs. According to one of Gottschalk's anecdotes recorded later in his *Responsa de diversis*—his only description of the synod—Aeneas, a royal notary who later became Bishop of Paris, argued at Quierzy that logic (*dialecta*) dictated how Gottschalk's reading of Augustine had to be wrong. When several abbots present at the synod later reminded Gottschalk of this argument, his response was: "Logic discerns truths from falsehoods, and does not—God forbid!—confuse them," which was quite likely his earlier reply to Aeneas.⁷⁸ Whether Aeneas acted as the chief prosecutor, or was simply one of those who spoke against Gottschalk is impossible to tell. Yet Aeneas' argument is revealing for the attitude of the bishops and clergy there as a whole: it was based (they thought) on reason—or what seemed possible and what seemed impossible to them—rather than on a detailed analysis of Augustine's texts. Aeneas had not read Augustine's anti-Pelagian writings very carefully (if at all), and therefore he had no idea that Gottschalk was actually correct in his reading of the later Augustine's ideas. This anecdote shows how the bishops viewed Gottschalk's trial as an occasion only for correction, which involved an

⁷⁵ *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 849, ed. Grat et al., pp. 56–7.

⁷⁶ Florus, *Libellus de tribus*, ed. Zechiel-Eckes, pp. 366–8. See also Zechiel-Eckes, *Florus*, pp. 142–3.

⁷⁷ Florus, *Libellus*, ed. Zechiel-Eckes, p. 368. See also Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, p. 42 who suggested that Gottschalk had instead his *Confessio brevior* at Quierzy.

⁷⁸ Gottschalk, *Responsa de diversis*, *CEG*, pp. 156–7. On Aeneas, see *Recueil des actes de Charles II le chauve*, ed. Georges Tessier, vol. 3 (Paris, 1955), III, pp. 60–4.

interrogation and an attempt to convince him how wrong his ideas were, rather than any investigation of Augustine's works.

In this way, Gottschalk found that, as at Mainz, he was faced with a body of opponents ignorant of Augustine's later understanding of the doctrinal issue in question, but with the canonical authority to condemn him as a heretic for espousing those very ideas. Their perception of Augustine, informed by Carolingian tradition stemming back to Alcuin, by Hrabanus' writings, and by the verdict of the Synod of Mainz, meant that all of Gottschalk's arguments, however he might be able to support them with textual evidence, were in vain. As at Mainz, Gottschalk must have thought that nothing less than divine truth, his individual salvation, and his reputation as a teacher were at stake. In an act of defiance displaying his disdain for the gathering's heresy and what he must have seen as its abuse of authority, Gottschalk insulted the assembly and refused to recant—a strategy that provoked the bishops to act sternly, but fully within the bounds of their canonical authority. What Gottschalk saw as a righteous act of resistance, the bishops and abbots understood as wicked contumacy in the face of their legitimate authority.

Gottschalk's refusal to recant is the only known case of someone defying a church assembly in person when condemned for heresy in the Carolingian era. During the Adoptionist Controversy, Felix of Urgel found himself under the same pressure as he stood before Charlemagne and his bishops, when he was convicted of heresy in the 790s.⁷⁹ He accepted the council's ruling, recanted, and was not subjected to any physical punishment like Gottschalk quite possibly because he was not a monk. He was then imprisoned for the rest of his life for the safety of other Christians. Like Gottschalk, however, he later was found to hold his same views. Probably terrified by the authority of the synod and its power to punish him, Felix avoided further confrontation and danger by abandoning open resistance.

In Gottschalk's case, the synod was not willing to allow his scorn for its authority to go unpunished. Hincmar, in the account preserved by Florus, wrote that the abbots and monks judged Gottschalk to be insolent and worthy of the scourge, according to the Rule of Benedict, and then the bishops damned him according to ecclesiastical law, since he had involved himself in worldly affairs and he did not wish to examine himself or be humbled.⁸⁰ Hincmar included the document of Gottschalk's sentence at the end of his *Ad reclusos* (a document written within a year or so after the synod), which reveals the specific reasons for Gottschalk's condemnation and punishment:

The ecclesiastical sentence against the most pertinacious Gottschalk, on account of his incorrigible obstinacy, in the synod held at Quierzy produced by twelve bishops with ecclesiastical vigor:

⁷⁹ Cavadini, *Last Christology*, pp. 71–102 and 107–27; and Ganz, "Theology," pp. 762–3. For comparisons between Gottschalk's other Carolingian heretics' sentences, see Pezé, "Hérésie," pp. 176–86.

⁸⁰ Florus, *Libellus de tribus*, ed. Zechiel-Eckes, pp. 366–8.

Brother Gottschalk, you should know that lest you presume to perform it further, the sacrosanct office of priestly ministry—which you irregularly usurped and were not afraid to abuse in all ways with depraved acts and perverse doctrines up to this point—is utterly withdrawn from you (however you undertook it), by the judgement of the Holy Spirit, whose gift of grace is the sacerdotal office through the virtue of the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. Above all, because you, condemning ecclesiastical law, presumed to stir up both church and civil affairs contrary to the purpose and name of a monk, we decree by episcopal authority that you be punished with the severest blows and according to ecclesiastical law be remanded to the stronghouse, and, so that you should not presume to usurp for yourself the doctrinal office, we impose perpetual silence on your mouth by the power of the eternal word.⁸¹

Gottschalk's sentence was foremost an assertion of episcopal power against a monk who refused to recognize the bishops' authority with the required humility and respect, and who had "irregularly usurped" the priestly ministry. Gottschalk's "incurable obstinacy" is given as the overall reason for his sentence, which involved a loss of his position as a priest, corporal punishment, and imprisonment as a monk, and the burden of perpetual silence, which was an inversion of voluntary monastic sacred silence as practiced in the cloister.⁸² Gottschalk's sentence was chiefly meant to reduce him back to the status of an impure monk, and to separate or to quarantine him from other Christians lest he harm them with his teachings.⁸³ The bishops' message to Gottschalk was clear: he was not to presume to see himself as any kind of authority, and his career as a teacher and priest was at an end, since he had wrongfully seized and abused that ministry with "depraved acts and perverse doctrines." Here the bishops made clear that the critical right to define doctrine was a prerogative they jealously guarded.

Gottschalk was not the first uppity monk in the ninth century to dare to involve himself in the affairs outside the monastery. The injunctions against "wandering monks" have already been mentioned, and the 813 legislation reissued at the Synod of Mainz in 847 called for a strict separation of monks from church and secular matters. Similar arguments were made in the western Frankish realm only a few years earlier. At the Synod of Meaux-Paris in 845 and 846 the bishops under Hincmar's

⁸¹ *MGH Conc.* III, No. 18 [Quierzy, 849], pp. 198–9: "Ecclesiastica sententia in pertinacissimum Gotescalcum, propter incorrigibilem obstinationem illius, in sinodo apud Carisiacum habita a XII episcopis ecclesiastico vigore prolata. Frater Gotescale, sacrosanctum sacerdotalis ministerii officium, quod irregulariter usurpasti et in cunctis moribus ac pravis actibus atque perversis doctrinis eo hactenus abuti non pertinuisti, iudicio spiritus sancti, cuius gratiae munus est sacerdotale officium per virtutem sanguinis domini nostri Iesu Christi, noveris, tibi esse, si quo modo suscepisti, sublatum et, ne ulterius eo fungi praesumas, penitus interdictum. Insuper, quia et aecclesiastica et civilia negotia contra propositum et nomen monachi conturbare contemnens iura ecclesiastica praesumpsisti, durissimis verberibus te castigari et secundum aecclesiasticas regulas ergastulo retrudi auctoritate episcopali decernimus, et, ut de cetero doctrinale tibi officium usurpare non praesumas, perpetuum silentium ori tuo virtute aeterni verbi inponimus."

⁸² On monastic silence, see Paul Gehl, "Competens Silentium: Varieties of Monastic Silence in the Medieval West," *Viator* 18 (1987), pp. 125–60; Scott Bruce, *Silence and Sign Language in Medieval Monasticism: The Cluniac Tradition, c. 900–1200* (Cambridge, 2007), esp. pp. 13–52; and Ambrose Wathen, *Silence: The Meaning of Silence in the Rule of St. Benedict* (Washington, DC: 1973).

⁸³ Regarding what the rule and rule commentaries say about punishing and separating impure monks, see Coon, *Dark Age Bodies*, p. 126.

direction ruled that independent or “headless” (*acephali*) monks wandering about and disturbing civil and ecclesiastical matters against canonical authority were to remain in monasteries or otherwise be excommunicated.⁸⁴ Drawing from the canons of the 813 reform synods, Hrabanus and the bishops of the Synod of Mainz (847) had decreed that monks should live according to the Rule and should avoid worldly matters, which involved many dangers including: sexual temptations, desire for worldly goods, involvement in disputes and arguments, discussion of issues in court (save the protection of widows and orphans), foul words and making jokes, dice, fancy clothing, the pleasures of eating and drinking, involvement in unjust business affairs, and hunting.⁸⁵ Gottschalk appears to have represented the most extreme case of a monk in the 840s who was stirring up scandal and controversy, and the bishops at Quierzy responded quickly and severely to put a stop to it.

The bishops’ understanding of Gottschalk’s doctrines and his illegal teaching as depraved and perverse was certainly not unique to the Carolingian era, but instead goes back to the early church. In an influential and often-quoted letter, Pope Innocent I cursed his opponents’ teachings as the “perverse doctrines of the most depraved minds.”⁸⁶ The original inspiration for such a description was biblical, although Innocent modified the concept (meaning the pagans and idolaters from his scriptural sources) to characterize heretics instead. In Deuteronomy 32, 5, Moses accused some Israelites of being faithless and worshiping foreign gods, saying: “they sinned against him—they are not God’s sons in their vileness, this depraved and perverse generation!”⁸⁷ In his Letter to the Philippians, Paul encouraged the believers not to be like their pagan contemporaries: “May you be without complaint and simple sons of God without blame in the middle of a depraved and perverse nation among whom you shine like lights in the world.”⁸⁸

Early Christian authors, including Innocent as well as Jerome, Prosper of Aquitaine, and many others, characterized their opponents’ doctrines in these terms, distinguishing them from those who held (in their opinion) the true faith.⁸⁹ This tendency was adopted by Carolingian theologians, like Alcuin, Hrabanus, Lupus, and Hincmar (in his *Liber de praedestinatione*), who sometimes quoted directly from Pope Innocent’s letter, and contributed to a cultural understanding in the ninth century that heresy was a depravity and perversion.⁹⁰ Perverse doctrines defiled and polluted the faithful, as Hrabanus’ concerns about the purity of the church at the synod of

⁸⁴ *MGH Conc.* III, No. 11 [Meaux and Paris, 845 and 846], 57, pp. 61–132, here 111.

⁸⁵ *MGH Conc.* III, No. 14 [Mainz, 847], pp. 168–9.

⁸⁶ Innocent I, *Epistola* 30, *PL* 20: 589–93, here 591: “pravissimarum mentium perversa doctrina.”

⁸⁷ De 32, 5: “peccaverunt ei non filii eius in sordibus generatio prava atque perversa.” See also: Pr 8, 8: “iusti sunt omnes sermones mei non est in eis pravum quid neque perversum.”

⁸⁸ Ph 2, 15: “ut sitis sine querella et simplices filii Dei sine reprehensione in medio nationis pravae et perversae inter quos lucetis sicut luminaria in mundo.”

⁸⁹ Early Christian descriptions of heresy in these terms are numerous, see for example: Jerome, *In Esaiam*, VI, 13, ed. Marcus Adriaen, *CCSL* 53 (Turnhout, 1963), p. 232; id., *In Michaeam*, II, 6, ed. Adriaen, p. 502; Prosper, *Liber de gratia dei et libero voluntatis arbitrio*, I, 3 *PL* 51: 205–12, here 207, quoting from Innocent I’s letter; Coelestinus I, *Epistolae* 31, *PL* 50: 528–37, here 532; and Isidore of Seville, *Synonyma de lamentatione animae peccatrix*, II, 3, *PL* 83: 825–68, here 845.

⁹⁰ Alcuin, *Liber contra haeresim Felicis*, 1, ed. Gary Blumenshine (Vatican City, 1980), p. 55; Hrabanus, *Regum*, 6, *PL* 109: 29; id., *Ecclesiasticum*, VI, 4 and IX, 2, *PL* 109: 953 and 1057; Lupus,

Mainz in 847 attest. Abigail Firey's research into Carolingian clerical views of heresy as pollution suggests that his perspective was typical.⁹¹ The sacramentaries from Charlemagne's era indicate that the clergy treated Christians who came into contact with heresy—whether through receiving the sacraments from heretical clergy or by adopting heretical beliefs themselves—as no longer pure. In the Gellone Sacramentary, a manuscript closely associated with Charlemagne's court and its struggle against the Adoptionist heresy, those baptized by heretical clergy required a ceremony of reconciliation so that they might commune with the faithful.⁹² In the Autun Sacramentary a period of penance from forty days to ten years was required, depending on the circumstances of their contact or association with heretics, to purge them and make them acceptable to an orthodox congregation.⁹³ Concern for liturgical reforms among Carolingian rulers and their bishops suggests that such instructions were followed at least to some degree, and their existence reveals that the clergy and probably the laity perceived doctrinal threats as a source of spiritual contagion.⁹⁴

Contact with heresy involved sin and the taint of pollution. Such contagion could be removed with sacraments and penance, and defiled persons were to remain separate from the faithful until they had performed the necessary steps. The Gellone Sacramentary also included prayers for those deluded by the devil and caught up in "heretical depravity" (*eretica pravitas*) so that with divine help they might abandon their error.⁹⁵ Special prayers to those saints known to have battled heresy, such as Felix of Nola, Hilary, and Gregory the Great were provided for the protection of the congregation.⁹⁶ Another blessing was for salt and water that was to be used to purify locations so that, among other things, the spirit of heresy would not trouble them.⁹⁷

A letter that Hincmar wrote to Pope Nicholas I (early 864) reveals that the bishops at Quierzy feared that Gottschalk's teachings were a source of perversion to others, and his imprisonment was necessary to prevent this. Hincmar wrote this letter in the context of a dispute he was having with Bishop Rothad of Soissons, whom he had deposed and who was seeking Nicholas' help in recovering his see. Hincmar wrote that he and the council feared that Bishop Rothad was incapable of containing Gottschalk and protecting those whom he might "pervert" with his teachings.⁹⁸ Gottschalk had been ordained to the priesthood under Rothad's nose—supposedly without his knowledge—and this precedent made the council and especially Hincmar fear that Rothad might help Gottschalk's heresy spread

Collectaneum de tribus quaestionibus, PL 119: 647–66, here 662, quoting from Innocent's letter; and Hincmar, *Liber*, 21, PL 125: 192, quoting from Innocent's letter.

⁹¹ Firey, *A Contrite Heart*, pp. 111–58.

⁹² *Gellonensis*, 2391–4, ed. Dumas, pp. 348–50; see also Chazelle, *The Crucified God*, pp. 79–99.

⁹³ *Augustodunensis*, 2286–8 and 2291–300, ed. Heimig, pp. 306–7.

⁹⁴ McKitterick, *Frankish Church*, pp. 115–54; and Hen, *The Royal Patronage*, pp. 65–95 on the period of Charlemagne.

⁹⁵ *Gellonensis*, 660–1, ed. Dumas, p. 89.

⁹⁶ *Gellonensis*, 129 (Felix), 2067 (Hilary) and 2519 (Gregory), ed. Dumas, pp. 16, 288, and 384.

⁹⁷ *Gellonensis*, 2676 and 3021, ed. Dumas, pp. 420–1 and 484.

⁹⁸ Hincmar, *Epistola* 169, *MGH Epp.* VIII, pp. 160–1.

either through carelessness or even sympathy with it. Although this letter was written approximately fifteen years after his trial when Rothad had become an opponent of the archbishop, Hincmar displayed a remarkable consistency in explaining the council's grounds for Gottschalk's imprisonment. This continuity suggests that Hincmar at Quierzy in 849 did perceive Gottschalk as a threat that endangered the purity of the church and the faithful, and that Rothad was deemed an unreliable jailor.

Hincmar wrote his longest account of Gottschalk's trial in his *Liber de praedestinatione* in 859. Whereas his justification for Gottschalk's condemnation and punishment in his *Annales* account was the precedent from Mainz and the authority of Charles the Bald, here Hincmar sought to prove that the synod's proceedings were canonical by listing the names of the bishops, abbots, and clerics involved and the texts used to determine his punishment.⁹⁹ This account was written a decade after the synod, when Hincmar sought to defend his position on predestination and the decision to punish Gottschalk at Quierzy against the criticisms levelled by his opponents during the 850s.¹⁰⁰ Added to the bishop's list were several clerics who had been present and who had become bishops during the 850s, suggesting that Hincmar was trying to show that all of the clerics (not just the bishops) who participated in the synod were worthy and pious figures and therefore their decision was just and legitimate. Yet the number of bishops recorded here (not counting the chorbishops) was thirteen—one more than the twelve bishops accounted for in Gottschalk's sentence from 849. While the number could have been a mistake, it is possible that one bishop refused to agree to the condemnation. Perhaps Rothad, described as Gottschalk's unreliable keeper, was seen as such because he refused to condemn him in 849. This would help to explain why he appeared unsuitable to the bishops, but it seems likely that Hincmar would have mentioned this point in his letter to the pope in 864, when the archbishop's chief concern was to destroy Rothad's reputation.

In this account, Hincmar also indicated that the Agathan canons and the Rule of Saint Benedict served as sources for Gottschalk's punishment as a "reprobate" (*improbis*) monk.¹⁰¹ As in the case of his *Annales* account, Hincmar stressed that

⁹⁹ Hincmar listed those present at the synod in *Liber*, 2, PL 125: 85; reprinted MGH Conc. III, No. 18 [Quierzy, 849], pp. 195–6: "Wenilone Sennensium archiepiscopo, Hincmaro Remorum episcopo, Folcoino Morinensium episcopo, Teuderico Camaracensium episcopo, Hrothado Suessonicae civitatis episcopo, Ragenario Ambianensium episcopo, Immone Noviomagensium episcopo, Erpoino Silvanectensium episcopo, Lupo Catalaunensium episcopo, Yrminfrido Belvacensium episcopo, Pardulo Laudunensium episcopo, Teutoboldo provinciae Lugdunensium et Lingonicae civitatis episcopo, Gernobrio Turonensium provinciae episcopo, Rigboldo Remorum chorepiscopo, Witao Camaracensium chorepiscopo et aliis, qui nunc dei gratia episcopi ordinati, tunc autem iam dictae synodo cum episcopis suis secundum ecclesiasticum morem fuerunt, Wenilo scilicet, tunc cum Ragenario patre suo, nunc autem Rotomagensium archiepiscopus, Aeneas notarius sacri palatii et modo Parisiorum episcopus, Isaac diaconus Parduli et nunc Lingonicae civitatis episcopus. Sed et venerabiles abbates synodo ipsi interfuerunt, Ratbertus Corbeiae, Bavo Orbacis et Halduinus Alтивillariorum monasterii alique domini sacerdotes ac diaconi, Vulfadus quoque Remorum metropolis oeconomus et Rodoaldus archidiaconus cum aliis sequentibus cleri ordinibus."

¹⁰⁰ Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 108–50; Traube, *PLAC* III, pp. 717–19; Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 244–68; and Ganz, "Debate," pp. 297–300.

¹⁰¹ Hincmar, *Liber*, 2, PL 125: 85.

the bishops were in agreement with the decision from the Synod of Mainz. Gottschalk's sentence was noted as three-fold—loss of his status as a priest, flogging, and imprisonment—although noticeably absent was the punishment of imposed silence. Quite possibly Hincmar was embarrassed by the fact that in 859 he had been unable to enforce this part of the sentence for a decade and decided to leave it out. The main causes given for his sentence were that Gottschalk was a depraved heretic and that he was obstinately resistant to the bishops' authority. In order to justify the punishment, the archbishop listed the sources—the Rule of Benedict and the canons of Agde—that provided the bishops with the precedents for disciplining Gottschalk.

The Rule of Benedict provided the textual authority for flogging Gottschalk, and for isolating him within a monastery. It called for "reprobate" (*improbi*) monks—meaning those who refused to yield to the precepts of the rule, their seniors, or their abbots—to be subjected to punishment by the rod.¹⁰² The Rule also called for monks who were guilty of serious faults (*culpae*) to be separated from the other brothers, although it did not sanction imprisonment per se.¹⁰³ The Rule provided the only textual authority for flogging Gottschalk, and, according to Hincmar's *Liber*, his beatings at the synod were administered for his disobedience to the bishops there. According to his account preserved by Florus, however, Hincmar indicated that it was the abbots who had called for Gottschalk to be flogged.¹⁰⁴ This change suggests that Hincmar sought to stress the bishops' role in the synod in 859, while in his earlier document he described more freely the important part played by the abbots.

The Synod of Agde (506) made rulings regarding monks who became priests, and the imprisonment of priests. The canons stated that monks should only be ordained to the priesthood with the consent and goodwill of their abbots, that monks should not be ordained in cities or parishes, and that monks should not migrate to another monastery without the permission of their abbot.¹⁰⁵ The purpose of these canons was to keep monks under the supervision and control of their abbot, and provided grounds for depriving Gottschalk of his office, since he appears to have left Orbais once he became a priest, possibly using his new position as his way of doing so. The synod also ruled that bishops, priests, and deacons who committed a capital offence (*crimen capitale*) should be held in a monastery.¹⁰⁶ While this particular charge does not appear to have applied to Gottschalk's case, it provided precedent for incarcerating priests in monasteries who had committed serious crimes.

¹⁰² *La Règle*, 2, 23, and 28–9, ed. de Vogüé et Neufville, pp. 448, 542, and 550–4; *MGH Conc.* III, No. 18 [Quierzy, 849], pp. 196–9; Diem, "Verstoorder," pp. 128–9; and Coon, *Dark Age Bodies*, p. 126.

¹⁰³ *La Règle*, 25, ed. de Vogüé et Neufville, p. 546; and *MGH Conc.* III, No. 18 [Quierzy, 849], p. 199.

¹⁰⁴ Florus, *Libellus*, ed. Zechiel-Eckes, p. 367.

¹⁰⁵ "Concilium Agathense. 506," *Concilia Galliae a. 314-a. 506*, ed. Charles Munier, *CCSL* 148 (Turnhout, 1963), pp. 189–228, here 27, p. 205; No. 18 [Quierzy, 849], *MGH Conc.* III, p. 199; and Diem, "Verstoorder," pp. 128–9.

¹⁰⁶ "Concilium Agathense. 506," 50, ed. C. Munier, p. 225.

Incarcerating Gottschalk in the monastery's stronghouse or prison (*ergastulum*) for his alleged depravity and perversity, however, betrays the influence of a text not mentioned by Hincmar. It was a letter by Pope Siricius (d. 399), a papal advocate of celibacy among the clergy who offered Bishop Himerius of Tarragona in 385 a series of judgments on various church matters.¹⁰⁷ His letter was transmitted in two early medieval collections, Dionysius Exiguus' *Collectio decretorum* and the letters of Pope Zacharias to King Pippin, and was later adopted by Hincmar in various writings: in a work on rape, in one on the penance of King Pippin, and in what remains of a fragmentary letter to Louis the German regarding a wayward monk from Trier, Walto, who allegedly obtained a bishopric irregularly.¹⁰⁸

Siricius' letter is the key source for the bishops' decision to punish Gottschalk with perpetual imprisonment. Here we return to the issue of pollution, for Siricius condemned monks who were involved in the world of power outside the monastery and even defiled their monasteries by procreating sons, suggesting that they sought to have heirs in the world outside. The canon's concern with monks being polluted by their involvement in the world agrees especially with Hincmar's description of him as a perverse monk stirring up secular and ecclesiastical affairs. Had Gottschalk fathered his "little son" Gottschalk, who was with him in Dalmatia, then this would have been further reason to punish him with imprisonment. One must admit, however, that it seems likely such information would have been recorded in his sentence and by Hincmar in his accounts of the trial in order to show further evidence of Gottschalk's wrongdoing. Siricius' solution for monks like Gottschalk involved in worldly affairs was perpetual imprisonment and penance, with only the hope of the sacrament of communion and divine mercy at their death "so that closed up in their prisons mourning so great a crime with continual lamentation, they might be able to boil down with the purifying fire of penance, so that at least at death, indulgence could succor them through the grace of communion for the sake of mercy alone."¹⁰⁹ Hincmar and the bishops of the council appear to have understood Gottschalk in the terms outlined in Siricius' canon: he had become "tainted" by his heretical teachings and controversies in the world and had to be

¹⁰⁷ MGH Conc. III, No. 18 [Quierzy, 849], p. 199, n. 45 suggests a connection to Siricius' letters. See: Siricius, *Epistola ad Himerium episcopam Tarraconensem*, ed. Klaus Zechiel-Eckes and Detlev Jasper (Hanover, 2013); Daniel Callam, "Clerical Continence in the Fourth Century," *Theological Studies* 41 (1980), pp. 3–50; and Everett Ferguson, "Siricius (d. 399)," in *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, ed. id., vol. 2 (New York, 1999), p. 1064.

¹⁰⁸ Siricius, *Epistola ad Himerium*, 6, ed. Zechiel-Eckes and Jasper, p. 94; Dionysius Exiguus, *Collectio decretorum pontificorum Romanorum*, PL 67: 229–316, here 234; Zacharias, *Epistola VIII. Ad Pipinum majorem domus, itemque ad episcopos, abbates, et proceres Francorum*, 22, PL 89: 930–8, here 937; id., *Epistola ad domnum Pippinum*, 54, PL 98: 79–92, here 91; Hincmar, *De coerendo et extirpando raptu viduarum, puellarum ac sanctimonialium*, PL 125: 1017–36, here 1033–4; id., *Consilium de poenitentia Pippini regis*, PL 125: 1119–22, here 1119–20, here a truncated quotation; and Flodoard, *Historia*, III, 20, ed. Strattmann, pp. 262–8, here 266 where he quoted from a letter of Hincmar regarding the monk Walto.

¹⁰⁹ Siricius, *Epistola ad Himerium*, 6, ed. Zechiel-Eckes and Jasper, p. 94: "quatenus retrusae in suis ergastulis tantum facinus continua lamentatione deflentes, purificatorio possint poenitudinis igne decoquere, ut eis vel ad mortem saltem, solius misericordiae intuitu per communionis gratiam possit indulgentia subvenire."

isolated in a monastery for the good of the church. The bishops' concern was to protect the faith from what they believed to be a dangerous source of perversion and depravity, and the canon gave Hincmar grounds for imprisoning Gottschalk indefinitely, which he subsequently did.

Gottschalk's imprisonment and imposed silence, together with his beating, was the harshest recorded punishment of a Carolingian theologian. We are fortunate to have a contemporary critique of the synod's treatment of Gottschalk from Florus of Lyons. Writing in the early 850s, Florus offered the only surviving counterpoint to Hincmar's various portrayals of the council. In his *Libellus de tribus epistolis*, he both condemned Hrabanus' and Hincmar's position on predestination and harshly criticized their treatment of Gottschalk at the synods.¹¹⁰ Florus was one of the most learned Augustinian scholars of his day, and his reading of the church father's thought accorded quite well with Gottschalk's, although he did not condone the latter's disrespect for episcopal authority.¹¹¹ Despite Hincmar's claim to have punished him according to precedent and canonical authority, Florus questioned the canonical validity of the synod's proceedings by arguing that Hincmar and the bishops dealt with Gottschalk in a way wholly unlike that of the ancient church. Florus criticized the bishops for two reasons: first, for allowing the abbots, men of lesser rank, to judge Gottschalk according to the Rule of Benedict before they did; and second, for punishing him excessively out of anger for his outbursts against them.¹¹² He was appalled at the treatment Gottschalk received at the council, writing how, according to eyewitnesses, "he most cruelly and mercilessly had been torn to pieces nearly to death" (*atrocissime et absque ulla misericordia paene usque ad mortem dilaceratus*) and was forced to burn his *libellus* after his flogging rather than having been convinced through argument that it contained any error; Florus also claimed that his cruel solitary confinement would lead Gottschalk to nothing but despair.¹¹³

In Florus' opinion, Gottschalk's sentence was carried out entirely differently from the methods of the early church, when doctrinal debates were won (according to Florus' perception) through dispute rather than force or coercion.¹¹⁴ Devisse dismissed Florus' complaints about Gottschalk's handling as exaggeration and noted that the bishops had simply punished him according to the Rule of Benedict.¹¹⁵ Yet Devisse missed the spirit of Florus' accusation: the bishops may have prosecuted Gottschalk within the legal bounds of the ancient church, but they did so without what he saw as its nourishing pastoral and vigorous intellectual spirit.

¹¹⁰ Florus, *Libellus de tribus*, ed. Zechiel-Eckes, pp. 320–1, 340, 347, 361, 366–7, 371, 374–5, 379–81, 387, 394–5, and 403–14.

¹¹¹ Ganz, "Debate," p. 121; and Zechiel-Eckes, *Florus*, pp. 131–50.

¹¹² Florus, *Libellus de tribus*, ed. Zechiel-Eckes, p. 367.

¹¹³ Florus, *Libellus de tribus*, ed. Zechiel-Eckes, pp. 367–70.

¹¹⁴ Florus, *Libellus de tribus*, ed. Zechiel-Eckes, pp. 369–70. On the use of force or the threat of it in ancient debates, see Ramsay MacMullen, *Voting about God in Early Church Councils* (Yale, 2006), pp. 56–66.

¹¹⁵ Devisse, *Hincmar*, p. 129.

That Gottschalk only submitted to burning his *libellus* after being beaten “nearly to death,” indicates that he was forced quite brutally by the bishops and abbots to yield to their authority. He did not willingly recant, which meant that they had ultimately failed to make Gottschalk accept what they regarded as his and their respective positions in the church hierarchy. Despite his conviction, Gottschalk continued to see himself as the correct interpreter of Augustine, and must have regarded his resistance to the bishops as the latest expression of his authority as a divinely inspired theologian-martyr, who had suffered once again at the hands of his heretical persecutors.

CONCLUSION

In his *Confessio prolixior* Gottschalk cast himself in a unique role in the Carolingian Empire. He used an original variation of the Augustinian *confessio* and imitated the church father’s scriptural voice to frame his theological arguments as the true and orthodox teachings of the ancient church, and to outline a martyr’s ordeal in which he would witness his faith and survive unharmed thanks to divine intervention. Joining the theologian with the martyr in this way, Gottschalk sought to undermine his condemnation at the Synod of Mainz (848), and either to win over Hincmar and other readers to his doctrine or to force them (through their refusal) to reveal that they were among the reprobate rather than the elect. Speaking as a modern-day Augustine and a martyr was also key to linking his own struggles and sufferings with those of ancient church’s heroes, and thereby he was able to transform, in his own eyes at least, his experiences at Mainz into unjust persecution at the hands of heretical enemies of God. As ever, Gottschalk was intentionally a force for creating division in the church in order to identify the elect and distinguish them from the reprobate.

This chapter’s study of the Synod of Quierzy has shown that the *Confessio prolixior* can be seen as representative of Gottschalk’s performance at that council, including his arguments, his sense of holiness and persecution, and his attitude of defiance against any bishops who might refuse to accept his doctrine. While intended as an ecclesiastical court to judge, correct and, if necessary, to punish Gottschalk, he turned the synod into a stage on which to play out his role as a theologian-martyr. To be sure, the bishops saw themselves as acting correctly against such a fierce and troubling display of disrespect. In this regard, they rejected Gottschalk’s novel joining of doctrinal argument, judicial ordeal, and miraculous spectacle as prideful and evidence of his error. They preferred the standard imperial apparatus of correction, and in this case they employed it with the utmost severity according to the canons as a response to his disturbing behavior. In addition to demoting and physically punishing Gottschalk, an especially important feature of the bishops’ response was to quarantine his spiritual contagion—something already seen at the Synod of Mainz (848). Yet at Mainz Gottschalk could simply be exiled, whereas now he had to be imprisoned in a monastery and contained there lest his ideas and aggressive teaching cause spiritual disease and death among the faithful.

This process shows some of the mechanisms of trying wayward clerics in the Carolingian world, although Gottschalk certainly stands out as the ninth-century's, and perhaps early medieval Europe's, most extreme case.

The *Confessio prolixior* and the events of the Synod of Quierzy have long made Gottschalk of extreme interest to post-medieval theologians and confessional historians. His affective expressions of Augustinian thought, his self-proclaimed status as one of the elect and a martyr, and his defiance of the imperial church hierarchy made him appear a proto-protestant long before the Reformation. Certainly some of Gottschalk's concerns resonate with these later religious and historical traditions, and their identification with him is understandable. Yet our task here has been to examine these issues in the context of Gottschalk's unusual career, and to evaluate his motivations and actions in his historical milieu. What is fascinating about Gottschalk in this stage of his life is that he found himself in uncharted territory: he was a convicted heretic and yet still certain not only that his understanding of doctrine was correct, but also that it had come to him through divine grace. As a result, he reached back to the ancient church—to his most beloved patristic authority, Augustine, and to the martyr tradition—in order to create an original, heroic role for himself in the present. Gottschalk's historical importance lies in the fact that his particular, original creation was not only controversial among the ruling forces of the Carolingian realm that condemned him, but also, as we will see, that it was very attractive among some monks and clerics in the Archdiocese of Rheims.

Letters from Prison, 849–851

Making sense of the Synod of Quierzy would occupy Gottschalk, Hincmar, and many others for decades to come, but especially in the first few years following his condemnation. This chapter analyzes how those involved in the dispute—generally known today as the predestination controversy—struggled to place a condemned, but still defiant dissenter within a shared framework of ideas inherited from antiquity. For the first time in over a century the Frankish world produced a heretic within its own borders who refused to accept his condemnation, a shocking and disturbing event previously feared but avoided through the diligent efforts of the imperial hierarchy. Gottschalk's continuing refusal to recant and accept correction was the ongoing source of this crisis, a state of affairs he regarded as necessary in his righteous mission of defying heretical opponents and revealing the truth of divine grace to the elect.

In ways previously unexamined, this chapter explores how Gottschalk articulated his dissent through the discourses of spirituality and reform by inverting many Carolingian assumptions about hierarchy, holiness, order, faithfulness, and correctness. Gottschalk made the controversy not only about the conceptual problems of sin and grace, but also about the authority to formulate dogma. By twice rejecting correction and continuing his activities, he called into question the episcopate's right to define correct doctrine, thereby suggesting for the first time in Carolingian history that the identification of salvific truth be separated from the church hierarchy. To this end, the Augustinian tradition enabled Gottschalk to offer an alternative theological vision from the one the Synods of Mainz and Quierzy claimed was correct and true. This ninth-century moment of division, uncertainty, controversy, and experimentation is an important opportunity for rethinking what intellectual and cultural assumptions held the Carolingian world together, even when some of its most significant thinkers disagreed about issues at the heart of the Frankish imperial reform project.

As will become evident, Gottschalk was not alone in his struggle. Quite quickly during his confinement at Hautvillers, he won over supporters within the very walls of the monastery meant to contain him. These largely young monks became his link to the outside world, securing books and writing materials for him while smuggling out his pamphlets which encouraged readers to embrace and confess his doctrine—a remarkable and hitherto unexamined episode of early medieval monastic intellectual culture. Gottschalk impressed these young brothers with his piety, his learning, and his absolute loyalty to his doctrine. With their help, Gottschalk pushed even further into uncharted ninth-century territory by maintaining

his rebellion and encouraging other monks and clerics, who might yet be revealed to be among the elect, to follow his example. Among his correspondents were old friends, such as Ratramnus and Giselmars at Corbie, as well as bishops not present at Quierzy like Amolo of Lyons, whom Gottschalk urged to preach omnipotent grace to their congregations.

Archbishop Hincmar realized with horror that the Synod of Quierzy in no way put a stop to Gottschalk's activities. He composed his own treatise on predestination and free will, his so-called *Ad reclusos et simplices*, and sent it to the clerics and monks of his archdiocese. Included in this treatise were Gottschalk's sentence of condemnation and a carefully-crafted denunciation of his character that identified him as a type of demonic agent, a pseudoprophet, seducing others into blasphemous heresy "for the sake of filthy material gain" (*turpis lucri gratia*).¹ Yet Hincmar's position on predestination was soon challenged, and the debate about grace mushroomed as the archbishop and King Charles the Bald solicited opinions from additional theologians, whose interpretations differed wildly—some condemning Gottschalk, others Hincmar. When the rulers of the three kingdoms of the divided Carolingian world gathered at the Assembly of Meerssen (851) and agreed to prevent dangerous, insane figures of Gottschalk's sort from disturbing the realm, he responded with his famous hymn *Ut quid iubes*, a poetic masterpiece expressing his faithfulness to God despite his suffering as an exile in the land of heretics.

GOTTSCHALK'S INCARCERATION AT HAUTVILLERS

Consequent to the bishops' decision at Quierzy, Gottschalk was incarcerated at Hautvillers in 849 under the supervision of its abbot, Haudoin, and he remained a prisoner there until his death in the late 860s.² Gottschalk's impressive literary output in 849 and 850 at Hautvillers, while supposedly in isolation and under imposed silence, was astounding. Hincmar's letter to Archbishop Egil Sens in 866 sheds some light on how Gottschalk's work was possible.³ Despite Gottschalk's wickedness, Hincmar told Egil, he had been treated well as an inmate at Hautvillers: he was given the same food to eat as the other monks, as well as clothing and wood for his fire in the *ergastulum*, which he referred to as Gottschalk's "residence" (*mansio*).⁴ Gottschalk must have won over the brothers who attended to his daily needs rather quickly, and Hincmar complained to Egil that Gottschalk's numerous supporters (*fautores*) included the monk Guntbert, who often met with Gottschalk in secret and smuggled texts in and out of his cell.⁵ Through such intermediaries as Guntbert,

¹ Hincmar, *Ad reclusos*, ed. Gundlach, pp. 259–60. See also Dutton, *The Politics of Dreaming*, pp. 131–2.

² Mancaux, *Histoire*, pp. 238–53; Traube, *PLAC* III, pp. 714–20; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 23–8; and Epperlein, *Herrschaft*, pp. 233–42. The date of Gottschalk's death is uncertain.

³ Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, pp. 47–8; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 26–8.

⁴ Hincmar, *Epistola* 187, *MGH Epp.* VIII, p. 196.

⁵ Hincmar, *Epistola* 187, *MGH Epp.* VIII, pp. 194–6.

Gottschalk transformed Hautvillers from a prison into the staging ground for continued dissent against Hincmar and the dissemination of his doctrine.

Evidence from the monastery's *necrologium*, though recorded some twenty years later following his death, suggests that Gottschalk was received there by some as one wrongly convicted by the bishops at Quierzy. The text included his name, "Godescalkus," on the anniversary of his death on October 30, when the monks would pray for his soul, obviously in direct contradiction to Archbishop Hincmar's orders and Gottschalk's condemnation.⁶ It was common practice in Carolingian monasteries to list the names of those departed in memorial books, who then received prayers for their souls on the anniversary of their deaths.⁷ His name in the memorial book suggests that perhaps some brothers there did not agree with the synod's decision even when he arrived in 849.

Gottschalk's presence also appears to have transformed the atmosphere at Hautvillers. One way this happened, as Hincmar noted in his letter, was that Gottschalk refused to wash—including even his hands or face.⁸ Hincmar mentioned this detail to show that Gottschalk was a difficult, "insane" figure.⁹ Yet in choosing not to wash himself, Gottschalk could have been emulating an ancient example of sanctity. According to Evagrius' translation of the *Vita Antonii*, a text that Gottschalk quoted in his *Responsa de diversis*, Anthony "never washed his body, never removed dirt from his feet, except when he needed to pass through water."¹⁰ Anthony, a solitary figure living in the desert wilderness and known for his intense devotion and extreme asceticism, was believed to have remained fit and healthy thanks to God's blessings despite such mortification of his flesh.¹¹ Instead of evidence of his "insanity" as Hincmar wanted his reader to believe, Gottschalk's refusal to bathe could have been an act of austere devotion in imitation of Anthony,

⁶ LeMaitre, *Répertoire*, II, no. 1687, pp. 726–7, referring to Mabillon's notes in Paris B.N.F. MS Lat. 11902, where the name "Godescalkus" appears on fol. 5r under III. kal. November (October 30); Mabillon, *Annales*, vol. III, XXXVI, 42, p. 125; and *Gallia Christiana*, IX, p. 423.

⁷ Karl Schmid and Joachim Wollasch, *Societas et Fraternitas: Begründung eines kommentierten Quellenwerkes zur Erforschung der Personen und Personengruppen des Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1975); Otto Gerhard Oexle, "Memoria und Memorialüberlieferung im früheren Mittelalter," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 10 (1976), pp. 70–95; *Die Reichenauer Mönchsgemeinschaft und ihr Totengedenken im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Roland Rappmann and Alfons Zettler (Sigmaringen, 1998); and Dieter Geuenich, "A Survey of the Early Medieval Confraternity Books from the Continent," in *The Durham Liber Vitae and its Context*, ed. David Rollason, A.J. Piper, Margaret Harvey, and Lynda Rollason (Woodbridge, 2004), pp. 141–7.

⁸ Hincmar, *Epistola* 187, *MGH Epp.* VIII, p. 196.

⁹ Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 26–8.

¹⁰ Athanasius, *Vita beati Antonii abbas*, 23, trans. Evagrius, *PL* 73: 125–70, here 147: "nunquam corpus lavans, nunquam pedibus sordes ablvens, nisi cum per aquas transire necessitas compulisset." Gottschalk, *Responsa de diversis*, *CEG*, pp. 170 and 177. On Athanasius, see also Khaled Anatolios, *Athanasius* (New York, 2004), pp. 1–86; *Saint Antoine entre mythe et légende*, ed. Philippe Walter (Grenoble, 1996); and Athanasius, *Vie d'Antoine*, trans. G.J.M. Bartelink (Paris, 1994), pp. 27–108 for a discussion of the author and the text.

¹¹ Georgia Frank, *The Memory of the Eyes: Pilgrims to Living Saints in Christian Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 2000), pp. 96–101 and 143–5. For a brief overview of the medieval reception of Anthony, see Jean LeClercq, "Saint Antoine dans la tradition monastique médiévale," *Antonius Magnus Eremita, 356–1956: Studia ad antiquum monachismum spectantia*, ed. Basil Steidle (Rome, 1956), pp. 229–47.

a model appropriate to his “removal” from the community and his life in isolation, and his belief that he was a divinely-inspired defender of God’s truth.

Performing ascetic purity through emulating a beloved ancient, monastic saint might have been Gottschalk’s approach to countering the accusations of his heretical contagion and impurity. We might also interpret this behavior as a symbolic reaction to his excommunication. Some time after his beatings at the Synod of Quierzy, Gottschalk asked Hincmar to be allowed to receive communion, perhaps because his injuries made him fear that he might not live much longer.¹² Hincmar, apparently unsure what to do, sought Hrabanus’ advice, who recommended that he not allow it unless Gottschalk first gave up his doctrines. After his recovery, Gottschalk may have refused to wash as one excommunicated and therefore removed from the community at Hautvillers. The Rule of Benedict stressed the importance of the brothers washing their hands and feet before meals, of washing the feet of guests, and even maintaining the cleanliness of their garments.¹³ The monastic reformer Benedict of Aniane, in his *Concordia regularum*, cited the Rule of the Master, which required the monastery’s kitchen servers to provide monks with water to wash their hands before receiving Communion, and to keep washing towels and specifically facial towels clean.¹⁴ The Benedictine commentator Hildemar emphasized monastic washing as essential to the purity and spiritual joy of individual members of the cloister’s community.¹⁵ Cleanliness—associated in monastic life with communal purity, the participation in the Eucharist, and eating at common meals and with welcomed guests—was something that Gottschalk could symbolically reject as someone prohibited from contact with the rest of the monastery.

Gottschalk also debated with Abbot Haudoin and criticized him, which won Gottschalk support among monks who disliked him. According to a cryptic passage in Flodoard’s *Historia*, monks who had fled from the monastery during the early 850s were forced to return there in 856 against their will by their Bishop Rothad and Archbishop Hincmar.¹⁶ Such monks may have left Hautvillers out of dislike for Haudoin. Evidence for Gottschalk’s exchanges with the abbot are found in his *Responsa de diversis*, a work that begins with a series of theological questions posed by an anonymous monk and then contains Gottschalk’s answers to them on quires supplied by the monk.¹⁷ That the work was written in the 850s on parchment sent to Gottschalk for that very purpose reminds us again that texts and writing materials traveled to and from his clearly quite porous cell.

¹² Hrabanus, *Epistola* 43, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 487–9, here p. 489.

¹³ *La Règle*, 35, 53, and 55, ed. de Vogüé et Neufville, pp. 556, 614, and 620.

¹⁴ Benedict of Aniane, *Concordia regularum*, 44, 8, ed. Pierre Bonnerue, *CCCM* 168A (Turnhout, 1999), p. 374. Reference is to *La règle du maître*, 19, ed. Adalbert de Vogüé, 3 vols. (Paris, 1964), II, pp. 90–8, here 96. See also M. Alfred Schroll, *Benedictine Monasticism as Reflected in the Warnefrid-Hildemar Commentaries on the Rule* (New York, 1941), pp. 37–9.

¹⁵ Hildemar, *Expositio regulae sancti Benedicti*, prologue, 6, 22, 35, and 55, ed. Rupert Mittermüller (Regensburg, 1880), pp. 204, 334, 395, 398, 400, and 520.

¹⁶ Flodoard, *Historia*, III, 21, ed. Stratmann, p. 280. See also Schrörs, *Hincmar*, p. 524.

¹⁷ Gottschalk, *Responsa de diversis*, *CEG*, pp. 130–79. For further discussion of this text, see Chapter 6.

Gottschalk related how the abbots of Orbais and Hautvillers tried to convince him soon after the synod that he had been defeated in disputation, but Gottschalk displayed the same contempt for their authority that he had shown at Quierzy. Gottschalk explained how Bavo, Abbot of Orbais, and Haudoin claimed that at the synod Aeneas had won the debate by arguing, as noted previously, that logic made Gottschalk's interpretation of Augustine's teaching on predestination impossible.¹⁸ Gottschalk, however, told his reader that he argued with Haudoin by means of a syllogism and silenced him by quoting an Isidorian commonplace: "Logic discerns truths from falsehoods, and does not—God forbid!—confuse them."¹⁹ Clearly Gottschalk meant to show how Aeneas had been wrong—logic *did* reveal the truth of twin predestination—and Haudoin was a fool to think otherwise. Then Gottschalk added about this exchange with the abbot triumphantly to the reader: "I confess he immediately went silent, and did not dare to say anything about it afterwards."²⁰

If this incident happened in this way, then Gottschalk's ability to draw so easily on patristic and biblical texts by memory probably annoyed and frustrated the abbot, while simultaneously impressing some of the monks at Hautvillers.²¹ Gottschalk could have quickly become something of an "underground" *magister* at Hautvillers not long after his arrival. While Haudoin probably sought to avoid arguing with him after his exchange about logic, he was still the object of Gottschalk's criticism, which on one occasion involved a comparison of the abbot with the Pharisees. Gottschalk mocked him as the "blind leading the blind and sending them into error" for having his monks sing a line of Psalm 117 differently from how it was sung "throughout the entire Latin world."²² This was a reference to Matthew 15, 14, where Christ tells the disciples, who complained that the Pharisees were denying his teachings: "Leave them! They are the blind and leaders of the blind, and if a blind man leads another blind man, both fall into a ditch."²³ As a well-traveled and highly-educated authority, who could combine his knowledge of the world with a biting and witty insult, Gottschalk could have impressed upon the monks that heresy spread by their superiors needed to be avoided even within the monastery and its daily practices.

Gottschalk's previous association with Ebbo may have gained him some allies as well.²⁴ His connections with Corbie and with Ratramnus in particular, were

¹⁸ Gottschalk, *Responsa de diversis*, *CEG*, pp. 156–7. On Aeneas, see *Recueil des actes de Charles II le chauve*, M. Georges Tessier (Paris, 1955), III, pp. 60–4.

¹⁹ Gottschalk, *Responsa de diversis*, *CEG*, pp. 156–7.

²⁰ Gottschalk, *Responsa de diversis*, *CEG*, p. 157: "Dialecta vera discernit a falsis non autem quod absit confundit vera cum falsis, fateor protinus tacuit, quin nihil postmodum hinc dicere ausus fuit." The source of this commonplace was probably Isidore, *Etymologiae*, I, 2, ed. Lindsay.

²¹ On monastic techniques of memory, see Mary Carruthers, *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetoric and the Making of Images, 400–1200* (Cambridge, 1998), passim but esp. pp. 1–35.

²² Gottschalk, *Responsa de diversis*, *CEG*, p. 142: "... Altdoinus caecus caecos ducens et in errorem mittens ..." and "per omnem orbem latinum." The psalm passage in question was Psalm 117, 22. See also Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, p. 67.

²³ Mt 15, 14: "Sinite illos caeci sunt duces caecorum/ caecus autem si caeco ducatum praestet ambo in foveam cadunt."

²⁴ Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 61–6.

certainly based on his old friendship with the former archbishop. On taking his see in 845, Hincmar had ordered those clerics, who had been ordained by Ebbo during his second tenure of office (840–1), to stop performing their duties, claiming that their ordinations were illegitimate since Ebbo had been deposed in 835.²⁵ Those who viewed Hincmar's actions as unjust and heavy handed may have understood the archbishop's persecution of Gottschalk as a part of his general battle against those associated with his predecessor. Hincmar himself later connected the two issues in his *De praedestinatione* in 859.²⁶

It is likely that any associations between Gottschalk and the Ebbo clerics grew stronger after 853, when Hincmar formally deposed them from their offices at the Synod of Soissons.²⁷ Yet certainly not all of these clerics were Gottschalk's allies, for one who suffered from the purge of 853 was one of Gottschalk's opponents: Haudoin. At the synod he was deprived of his rank as abbot, priest, and deacon, because he had been made deacon by Ebbo, and "uncanonically" ordained priest and abbot in the confusion of the civil war of the early 840s.²⁸ Haudoin was clearly not a supporter of Gottschalk, although Hincmar might well have believed that he had proved ineffective in dealing with Gottschalk at Hautvillers. Martina Stratmann has suggested that Hincmar himself became abbot after Haudoin's deposition, indicating that he sought a tighter control over the monastery, which may have included supervision of Gottschalk through what seemed at the time like more effective subordinates.²⁹

GOTTSCHALK'S CORRESPONDENCE WITH FRIENDS AND SCHOLARS

With the help of his supporters, Gottschalk soon wrote letters to friends and scholars to encourage them to give their opinions about Augustine's teaching on predestination and especially to accept his doctrine. The most illustrative piece of evidence for this contact is Gottschalk's verse letter to Ratramnus, from whom Gottschalk had already received two poems.³⁰ Gottschalk also sent a text to his old companion Giselmair, in which he stressed the key issues on which he differed from Hrabanus, although this text is now lost save for a few excerpts preserved by Hincmar.³¹ Gottschalk indicated to Ratramnus that he was sending his

²⁵ *MGH Conc.* II, No. 61 [Ingelheim, 840], *Narratio clericorum Remensium*, pp. 807–14.

²⁶ Nelson, *Charles*, pp. 168–9 notes the connection, referring to Hincmar, *Liber*, 36, *PL* 125: 386, where the archbishop complained that Gottschalk's allies were counted among those sympathetic to Ebbo.

²⁷ *MGH Conc.* III, No. 27 [Soissons, April 853], pp. 253–93, here 265–79.

²⁸ *MGH Conc.* III, No. 27 [Soissons, April 853], p. 275. See also Flodoard, *Historia*, III, 11, ed. Stratmann, p. 214; and Lambot, *CEG*, the notes on pp. 156–7.

²⁹ Stratmann, *Hincmar von Reims*, p. 57; and Manceaux, *Histoire*, pp. 258–61.

³⁰ Gottschalk, *Age, quæso*, *PLAC* III, p. 733; and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 151–2. On Gottschalk's letter, see Traube, *PLAC* III, p. 718; Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, pp. 44–5; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, p. 30; Bouhot, *Ratramne*, pp. 15–16; and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 246–84.

³¹ Gottschalk, *Fragmentum* 1 and perhaps also *Fragamenta* 22–5, *CEG*, pp. 9 and 41–4.

interpretation of Augustine's thought on predestination—probably a text known today as his *Confessio brevior*—along with the letter.³² Traube argued that Gottschalk probably sent his *Libellus* to Ratramnus, as well as to others, including Matcaudus, Lupus, Jonas, and Bishop Amolo of Lyons.³³ But the evidence suggests that Ratramnus and the others were sent a different work than the one the archbishop of Lyons received, for in his verse letter Gottschalk described the recipients of his text as scholars (*magistri*) and not bishops (*episcopi*). Likewise, the *Confessio brevior* survives in a Corbie manuscript of predestination texts that was probably put together for Ratramnus.³⁴ These linked texts—the verse letter and the *Confessio brevior*—provide the only example from Gottschalk's writings of 849 in which both the doctrinal text and accompanying letter survive, and for this reason they offer insights into how Gottschalk conveyed his views of predestination to a friend and fellow theologian. The two texts served different purposes: the letter was written specifically to Ratramnus to request his personal views on predestination, while the confession could be passed around separately to others to spread Gottschalk's doctrine. What emerges from these two works is that Gottschalk used similar strategies to influence Ratramnus as he did with Ebbo of Rheims in the 830s and Lupus of Chieti in the 840s: Gottschalk made his appeal by linking their personal relationship (in this case as Ratramnus' friend) with a concern for salvation. Gottschalk urged his old colleague to follow his example by believing and openly confessing twin predestination, which only one of God's elect could do.

By the time Gottschalk wrote his verse letter, Ratramnus' second poem had already arrived at Hautvillers on July 17.³⁵ Gottschalk's verse letter survives only in editions by the Jesuit editors Cellot and Sirmond from the seventeenth century.³⁶ According to Traube it was probably taken from a codex from Tours, Fleury, Rheims, or Corbie, since both editors worked at the Jesuit College of Clermont in Paris, whose manuscripts were drawn from these places.³⁷ The letter includes a short introductory address to Ratramnus of thirty-two lines, followed by the body of the letter of one hundred and fifty-four lines in hexameters.³⁸ While previous scholars have argued that the verse letter can be dated after July 17, 850, it is better dated to 849, for this places it between the second of Ratramnus' two verse letters and the lost *cartula*, which he wrote in late 849 or early 850.³⁹ The *cartula* was a critique of Hincmar's *Ad reclusos*, and Gottschalk would have had no need to ask Ratramnus for a clarification of his views on Augustine's thought once the *cartula* was written.⁴⁰

³² Gottschalk, *Age, quaeso*, PLAC III, p. 736; and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 157–8.

³³ Traube, PLAC III, p. 717. ³⁴ Lambot, *CEG*, pp. xx–xxi.

³⁵ Gottschalk, *Age, quaeso*, line 1, PLAC III, p. 733.

³⁶ Jacques Sirmond, *Hincmari opera* (Paris, 1645), I, p. 555 for verses 107–32; and id., *Ennodii opera* (Paris, 1650), p. 20 for verses 1–10; Louis Cellot, *Historia Gottschalchi praedestinatiani* (Paris, 1655), pp. 415–18.

³⁷ Traube, PLAC III, p. 733; id., *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen* (Munich, 1909), I, pp. 17–18; and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 118–21 and 132.

³⁸ Gottschalk, *Age, quaeso*, PLAC III, pp. 733–7.

³⁹ Traube, PLAC III, pp. 716–18; and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 254–7.

⁴⁰ On the lost *cartula*, see Bouhot, *Ratramne*, pp. 12–15.

Gottschalk's verse letter portrayed its author as someone in need of help, and his correspondent as someone capable of offering it:

Come now, I ask, go, Clio,
 Returning with faithful heart;
 Hasten, swift maiden,
 Go back, wise offspring,
 Whose brother is Apollo.
 Thus, I pray, bear just as in flight
 To my friend Ratramnus,
 Lord, father, teacher,
 This meter from my unpolished pen,
 Which I gladly send,
 To that famous and brilliant man,
 Whom I love ever truly
 With a pious and benign heart,
 As it is given to me, the least, by God,
 Who gives everything good to the one asking,
 Without whom his pupils would
 Be unable to exist at all.
 Therefore, just as you have been asked,
 Go, may you be held by no delay
 And may you see the beautiful face of my comrade.
 For twice you have come from that teacher,
 Beautiful one, taking away bitterness, bringing honey;
 You revive the mouth of the nursling [twice]
 With a sweet feast, with a pleasing flavor.
 When you see this man sitting,
 Teaching others rightly
 To ask the powerful God
 that he give them pious calm;
 I ask you, give him perpetual greeting.⁴¹

Gottschalk characterized Ratramnus as *dominus*, *pater*, *magister*, *sodalis*, and *amicus*—emphasizing his reader's lordly authority and paternal responsibility as a teacher on the one hand, and on the other his intimate relationship with him as a comrade and friend at Corbie nearly twenty years before.⁴² By linking these two sets of identifications together, Gottschalk hoped to encourage Ratramnus to see that his impressive learning and the ties between them called upon him to help

⁴¹ Gottschalk, *Age, quaeso*, *PLAC* III, lines 1–32, p. 733: “Age, quaeso, perge, Clio,/ Remeando corde fido;/ Propera, celer virago,/ Repeda, sagax propago,/ Cui frater est Apollo./ Ob id hoc velut volando/ Fer amico ovans Rathramno,/ Domino, patri, magistro,/ Calamo metrum impolito,/ Quod ei libens remitto,/ Celebri viro et corusco,/ Amo quem satis profecto/ Animo pio ac benigno,/ Datur ut mihi maligno/ Ab eo deo, bonum qui/ Dabit omne flagitanti,/ Sine quo nihil fore ulli/ (Liquet ut) valent alumni./ Igitur, velut petita/ Es, abi, mora nec ulla/ Tenearis ac decora/ Videas sodalis ora./ Bis enim venis ab illo/ Speciosa iam magistro/ Adimens fel, imprimens mel;/ Reficis <bis> os alumni/ Dape dulci, odore suavi./ Ubi hunc vides sedentem,/ Alios probe docentem,/ Rogitent deum potentem,/ Det ut his piam quietem,/ Rogo, dic iugem salutem.” See also Weber, *Gedichte*, p. 257.

⁴² Traube, *PLAC* III, pp. 715–18, and Bouhot, *Ratramne*, pp. 12–18.

Gottschalk in his current struggle. Gottschalk also asked Ratramnus to respond to his interpretation of Augustine in prose rather than verse, indicating that his friend had not previously made his convictions clear in his poetry.⁴³ He flattered Ratramnus, saying that he had already been in contact with other scholars at court and elsewhere (including Matcaudus, Jonas, and Lupus), but he regarded his friend's interpretation as the most important.⁴⁴ Gottschalk indicated that no one had responded to his inquiries yet except one who carefully balanced his response so that it agreed neither with his own position nor that of his enemies, but instead found a "safe" middle ground.⁴⁵

Gottschalk urged Ratramnus to understand that his response to his inquiry was related to Ratramnus' ultimate salvation. Gottschalk praised his old friend for his humility, and desired him to understand that he was not merely saying words when expressing his views on predestination: he needed to complete (*patrare*) them in his heart to achieve salvation. This emphasis on the mouth and heart brings to mind the formula of Romans 10, 10, which Gottschalk used in his *Libellus* and *Confessio prolixior* (as well as the accompanying *Confessio brevior*) to express how belief and confession of twin predestination would be his salvation.⁴⁶ Yet he also reminded Ratramnus that speaking could be accomplished even by the damned, and so he must act whole-heartedly on his conviction. It was God who could allow someone to believe truly through grace and who would protect him as his lamb (*agnus*):

I rejoice further, most venerable poet,
 Since you are lofty, because you put your trust in a humble honor,
 Whichever height you climb, you indicate that you crawl on the ground.
 For it pleases the king, as you know, splendid man,
 Who deemed to be most humble for your sake in the depths
 All the way to the sort of death which was the worst of all.
 As you do this with your mouth, if you strive to accomplish it with your heart,
 You will truly stand in the citadel of all the virtues.
 For it is easy for a man to confess that he is wretched with his voice,
 As a pretender does; but to preserve in the heart, what he begins,
 Belongs to the mind of the poor one ruling up in Olympus.
 For the damned lamenting frequently do the former;
 The elect, however, do this from the origin of the world:
 Hardly by their merits, but by the gift of the true Father.
 Happy, brother, happy, lofty teacher,
 Are those whom the Father loves in Christ in his benign way,
 Of whom no one perishes, whom the stream of blood
 Of the heavenly lamb redeems, who confers life upon them!
 Happy will be the least of the lambs,
 Neither lion nor robber, wolf nor dragon, brigand nor devourer

⁴³ Gottschalk, *Age, quaeso*, PLAC III, lines 70–9, p. 735.

⁴⁴ Gottschalk, *Age, quaeso*, PLAC III, p. 736; and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 157–8 for corrections to the text and p. 262 for a German translation.

⁴⁵ Gottschalk, *Age, quaeso*, lines 107–28, PLAC III, p. 736.

⁴⁶ Gottschalk, *Confessio brevior*, CEG, pp. 52–4, here p. 52.

Will ever seize any of them by force or deceits!

Indeed everything, which the Father bestowed upon him, will come to him.⁴⁷

Here again Gottschalk linked belief and confession with election, performing his belief from within his cell. Humility was characteristic of grace, yet even one of the damned could act humble as a pretender (*simulator*), he emphasized—doubtlessly thinking of the mendacious bishops at the synods who condemned him. Those with genuine humility, however, could not only speak humbly with their mouths but also believe humbly in their hearts thanks to grace. To believe that one's humility was exclusively the product of God's divine, freely given help was, Gottschalk maintained, the greatest act of humility—in fact, it was true humility. With this reminder, he must have hoped that Ratramnus would defy Gottschalk's opponents openly as he had done, in a display of humility in both his confession and belief and thereby combining writing with a more overt and controversial form of action. By acting as Gottschalk's "fellow lamb," Ratramnus was to understand that no enemy—"neither lion nor robber, wolf nor dragon, brigand nor devourer"—could force or trick him into giving up the true faith and, correspondingly, his election.

Gottschalk's emphasis on the humility of this action is most likely related to his conviction at the Synod of Quierzy, where he had been sentenced especially for his *contumacia*. In an effort to stress to Ratramnus that he was properly humble, he identified his defense of his doctrine as an expression of true humility. Gottschalk's accompanying *Confessio brevior*, just like his *Confessio prolixior*, also stressed his special role as a defender of divine truth. The text is quite brief, comprising of a short confession of faith, a series of biblical and patristic authorities (predominantly Augustinian texts) and then a concise conclusion.⁴⁸ The initial confession shows similarities to his earlier confessions:

I believe and I confess that the omnipotent and unchanging God foreknew and predestined the holy angels and elected people freely to eternal life, and simultaneously the devil, the head of all demons, with all his apostate angels and all wicked people (that is, his members) through his most just judgment rightly to eternal death most certainly on account of their own foreknown future, wicked deeds . . .⁴⁹

⁴⁷ Gottschalk, *Age quæso*, lines 133–54, *PLAC* III, pp. 736–7 and Weber, *Gedichte*, p. 158: "Gaudeo præterea, nimium venerande poeta,/ Sublimis cum sis, humili quod honore nitescis,/ Cumque polum subeas, quod humi te repere signas./ Nam placet istud ei, ut nosti, vir splendide, regi,/ Qui fore præhumilis pro te est dignatus in imis/ Mortis ad usque genus, quod erat super omnia peius./ Hoc velut ore facis, si corde patrare studebis,/ Cunctarum vere virtutum stabis in arce./ Nam facile est homini miserum se voce fateri,/ Ceu simulator agit; sed corde tenere, quod infit,/ Pauperis est animo in supero regnantis Olympo./ Illud enim reprobi faciunt persæpe gemendi,/ Hoc autem electi nimirum ab origine mundi:/ Idcirco haud meritis, veri sed munere patris/ Felices, frater, felices, celse magister,/ Quos pater in Christo delegit more benigno,/ Quorum nemo perit, quos sanguinis unda redemit/ Agni caelestis, qui vitam contulit illis;/ Felix, agnorum fuerit qui extremus eorum!/ Nec leo nec prædo, lupus ac draco, latro nec ambro/ Hinc rapient quenquam vel vi vel fraudibus unquam./ Omne quidem, quod ei tribuit pater, advenit illi."

⁴⁸ Gottschalk, *Confessio brevior*, *CEG*, pp. 52–4.

⁴⁹ Gottschalk, *Confessio brevior*, *CEG*, p. 52: "Credo et confiteor deum omnipotentem et immutabilem præcisse et prædestinasse angelos sanctos et homines electos ad vitam gratis æternam, et ipsum diabolum caput omnium daemoniorum cum omnibus angelis suis apostaticis et cum ipsis quoque universis hominibus reprobis membris videlicet suis propter præscita certissime

Here once more Gottschalk used the formula that he believed and confessed (*credo et confiteor*), characterizing his position as the orthodox one for his correspondents to embrace for their own salvation. Yet (after the initial confession) Gottschalk quickly moved to his other chief concern: evidence that Augustine had believed in twin predestination. The majority of the text is a series of quotations from the church father's works, especially his *In Iohannis evangelium* but also his *De agone Christi*, *Enchiridion*, *De perfectione iustitiae hominis*, and *De civitate Dei*—texts that formed key pieces of evidence in his *Confessio prolixior*.⁵⁰ He also sought to show that others after Augustine had held this same doctrine, quoting Gregory's *Moralia in Iob*, Isidore's *Sententiae*, and Fulgentius' *De veritate praedestinationis* and *Ad Monimum liber primus*.⁵¹

In the closing statement of his *Confessio brevior*, Gottschalk claimed that believing and confessing his doctrine revealed one's election. He wrote: "Thus I also believe and confess through all of these statements with these elect of God and catholic fathers, just as I am helped—divinely inspired, disposed and armed. Amen. For a false witness is he who corrupts either the meaning or the appearance in anyone else's writings."⁵² As in his *Confessio prolixior*, Gottschalk cast his resistance to his enemies in terms of being "divinely inspired, disposed and armed," and he condemned anyone who, like Hrabanus, mischaracterized his doctrine, echoing once more his accusations that his enemies were liars who intentionally misrepresented his and his patristic authorities' true doctrine.

Gottschalk must have hoped that Ratramnus would be inspired to adopt his confession for his own. Yet Ratramnus would have also known that Gottschalk's emphasis on confessing twin predestination as a sign of grace was a departure from Augustine's warnings that one could never be sure about receiving it. The Corbie monk certainly did support his old friend's doctrine first in his *cartula*, where he critiqued Hincmar's *Ad reclusos*, and later in his *De praedestinatione* in 850, although he did not publicly condone Gottschalk's behavior and instead wrote in a more measured and respectful tone to Charles the Bald.⁵³ Ratramnus' treatise is

ipsorum propria futura mala merita praedestinasse pariter per iustissimum iudicium suum in mortem merito sempiternam . . ."

⁵⁰ Gottschalk, *Confessio brevior*, *CEG*, pp. 52–4. Scriptural citations included: Jn 3, 18, and 32; 10, 26–9; and 16, 11; as well as I Co 9, 32. Patristic citations: Augustine, *In Iohannis evangelium*, 12, 12; 14, 8; 43, 13; 48, 4, and 6; 87, 2; 95, 4; 110, 2; and 117, 7; ed. Willems, pp. 127, 146, 378, 414–15, 544, 567, 615, and 623; id., *De agone Christi*, 27, 29, *PL* 40: 289–310, here 305; id., *Enchiridion*, 100, ed. Evans, p. 103; id., *De perfectione iustitiae hominis*, 13, 31, ed. Charles Urba and Josef Zycha, *CSEL* 42 (Vienna, 1902), p. 32; and id., *De civitate Dei*, XXII, 24, 5, ed. Dumbart and Kalb, pp. 851–2.

⁵¹ Gottschalk, *Confessio brevior*, *CEG*, p. 52–4; Gregory, *Moralia*, XXXIV, 2, 4, ed. Adriaen, p. 1735; Isidore of Seville, *Sententiae*, II, 6, 1, ed. Cazier, p. 103; Fulgentius, *De veritate praedestinationis*, III, 5, 8, ed. Fraipont, pp. 458–548, here p. 527; and id., *Ad Monimum liber primus*, ed. Johannes Fraipont, *CCSL* 91 (Turnhout, 1968), pp. 1–64, a work of three books that Gottschalk described as a single book.

⁵² Gottschalk, *Confessio brevior*, *CEG*, p. 54: "Sic et ego per omnia cum istis electis dei et catholicis credo et confiteor, prout divinitus afflatus animatus armatus adiuvor. Amen. Falsus enim testis est, qui in dictis quorumcumque aut sensum aut superficiem corrumpit."

⁵³ Ratramnus, *De praedestinatione dei*, ed. and trans. Roberts, pp. 68–376. See also Ganz, "Debate," pp. 290–1.

an impressive compilation of biblical and patristic texts (predominantly those of Augustine) with commentary.⁵⁴ Ratramnus also gathered Augustinian citations for Gottschalk to use in his debate with Hincmar, and his support would continue in the 850s.⁵⁵

Three scholars—Lupus, Matcaudus, and Jonas—also received texts from Gottschalk before July 17, 849. Of these three only one had responded to Gottschalk's interpretation of Augustine's thought, and he carefully managed to avoid agreeing or disagreeing with either Gottschalk or Hrabanus. Lupus of Ferrières was probably the author of this response, for "splitting the difference" accords with what he said in letters to Charles the Bald and Hincmar on the subject, and in his *Liber de tribus quaestionibus*.⁵⁶ That so many people asked for Lupus' opinion indicates how Gottschalk selected a potentially influential ally, although Gottschalk found no open support forthcoming from his old friend.⁵⁷ Yet this issue does not appear to have ended the relationship between Gottschalk and Lupus. For a surviving letter from Lupus to Gottschalk indicates that both continued their correspondence afterwards, and about subjects other than predestination. According to the letter, Gottschalk had written to Lupus asking him for an interpretation of a passage from Augustine's *De civitate Dei* on how the eyes of resurrected people would see God, as well as the meaning of certain Greek words.⁵⁸ Gottschalk also asked that Lupus return a quire (*quaternio*) to him; Lupus noted that "someone had picked up" (*nescio quis sublegerat*) the quire and was presumably bringing it back to Gottschalk.⁵⁹ Here we can see another example of the surreptitious movement of quires back and forth to Gottschalk's cell, a feature of the murkier side of life in the cloister highlighted in this study.

Of the two remaining scholars mentioned by Gottschalk in his verse letter, Matcaudus' identity remains a mystery, but Jonas is probably identifiable with the royal notary who became Bishop of Autun.⁶⁰ Jonas began as one of Charles the Bald's notaries in 841, was raised to the bishopric in 850, and retained that honor until 864/5.⁶¹ Gottschalk wrote to Ratramnus that some of the recipients of his work were court scholars, and as a royal notary destined for high office, Jonas certainly fit this profile. It may be significant that one of the manuscripts containing

⁵⁴ Ratramnus, *De praedestinatione dei*, ed. and trans. Roberts, pp. 26–41 where the editor includes a discussion of the text, its patristic borrowings, and its manuscripts; Ganz, *Corbie*, pp. 76–7 and 90–1 on his compilation methods; and Bouhot, *Ratramne*, pp. 35–41.

⁵⁵ Ganz, *Corbie*, pp. 76.

⁵⁶ Lupus, *Epistula* 130. *Ad Hincmarum praesulem and Epistula* 131. *Ad domum regem*, ed. Peter Marshall (Leipzig, 1984), pp. 122–8; Lupus, *Liber de tribus quaestionibus*, PL 119: 619–48; Traube, *PLAC* III, p. 717; Mitterauer, *Gottschalk*, pp. 143–54; Ganz, "Debate," pp. 289–90; and Chazelle, *Crucified God*, pp. 178–9.

⁵⁷ Thomas Noble, "Lupus of Ferrières in his Carolingian Context," in *After Rome's Fall: Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History*, ed. Alexander Murray (Toronto, 1998), pp. 232–50.

⁵⁸ Lupus, *Epistula* 30, *Ad Godescalcum mon[achum]*, ed. Marshall, pp. 37–41.

⁵⁹ Lupus, *Epistula* 30, ed. Marshall, p. 41.

⁶⁰ Traube, *PLAC* III, p. 717, who suggested that Matcaudus was Abbot Marcward of Prüm. On Marcward, see Depreux, *Prosopographie*, pp. 327–9.

⁶¹ Traube, *PLAC* III, p. 717; Denis de Sainte-Marthe, *Gallia christiana* (Paris, 1876), IV, pp. 364–5 and *Recueil des actes*, ed. Tessier, III, pp. 49–54.

some of Gottschalk's poetry—his *O deus miseri* and his *Ut quid iubes*—was an Autun codex from the ninth century, suggesting that there was interest or sympathy for his writings or ideas there.⁶² Jonas fulfilled his last duties as notary probably at Narbonne and Albi in October of 849 before occupying the see of Autun the next year.⁶³ There is no evidence that Jonas was present at Quierzy in 849, for Gottschalk's description of the debate, Hincmar's account of the trial, and Charles' surviving Quierzy charters from there from February through April all indicate that Aeneas, not Jonas, was active at the synod as the royal notary.⁶⁴

We do not know whether Jonas gave Gottschalk his interpretation of Augustine's thought, but evidence that Jonas remained in contact with him later implies that he did. For Jonas was probably the recipient of Gottschalk's grammatical treatise on the preposition "in," which Gottschalk sent to a new bishop and which survives in a manuscript made up of ninth and tenth century sections produced in Francia, containing other texts that a bishop might need, such as parts of Gregory the Great's *Registrum*.⁶⁵ Gottschalk probably sent Jonas his treatise, or *Explanatio*, just before the latter took up his bishopric, which suggests that he could expect him to receive it as a sympathetic reader:

I send to you this excellent and celebrated rule about the preposition "in" about which some are led into the greatest error and even those who confess that they have learned the greatest part of the doctrine of the grammatical art, especially since Donatus says about it—as you know—that "in" is subject to the accusative when signifying motion, while it is subject to only the ablative when signifying position or place. But nonetheless it must be conceded that it does not always do so, since it is found otherwise among more recent authors. Therefore I hope that the clemency of your serenity may deign to read through this rule with an effort of diligent meditation and commit it to the memory of your holiness. For I earnestly believe that if you should do so, you will be able to gain for yourself from it the greatest profit, and when you come to your bishopric, with life appearing a companion, you will be able to pose not unworthy questions to the grammarians from it.⁶⁶

⁶² The MS. is Autun, Bibliothèque Municipale 33. See Traube, "Carmina," p. 721 and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 85–7.

⁶³ *Recueil*, 118–20, ed. Tessier, I, pp. 313–19.

⁶⁴ *Recueil*, 111–13, ed. Tessier, I, pp. 293–303.

⁶⁵ Gottschalk, *De in praepositione explanatio*, *CEG*, pp. 359–74. The MS is Voss. Lat. Q. 17; see Karl Adriaan de Meyier, *Codices Vossiani Latini* (Leiden, 1975), II, pp. 48–52, here p. 49; and Bernhard Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts. Teil II; Laon-Paderborn* (Wiesbaden, 2004), p. 57.

⁶⁶ Gottschalk, *Explanatio*, *CEG*, pp. 359–61: "Vobis mitto egregiam inclitamque regulam de 'in' praepositione ex qua nonnulli maximum inducti sunt in errorem etiamque hi qui confitentur se plurimam habere partem de grammaticae artis doctrina, maxime idcirco quia Donatus dicit ut scitis quia 'in' quando motionem significat servit accusativo, quando siquidem situm vel locum ablativo tantummodo servit. Sed tamen non per omnia sequendus est quia apud autores neotericos alias repperitur. Igitur serenitatis vestrae expecto clementiam quo hanc dignemini regulam sedulae meditationis intentione perlegere ac memoriae sancitatis vestrae commendare, quia si id quod flagito studueritis agere maxime inde fructum potestis vobis adquirere, et cum in vestrum episcopium deveneritis vita comite existente quaestiones non ignobiles grammaticis de hoc potestis facere." The work may not have been Gottschalk's original design, but instead a Fulda tradition; Lambot points out the work of Ermenric, another former

The short treatise then includes numerous discussions about the use of “in” with examples drawn mostly from biblical passages.⁶⁷ Jonas could have proved a valuable ally, and Gottschalk sought to gain his favor and to show as a grammarian how error was possible in the misuse and misunderstanding of language. His respectful tone—very much like the one used to address Bishop Lupus of Chieti—suggests that he imagined Jonas might be sympathetic to his teaching. Grammar was a key issue for Gottschalk, since he believed that correct doctrine and worship were based on correct language, and it is therefore not hard to imagine why a gift of a grammatical work would be an important one.⁶⁸ Yet there is little evidence beyond the presence of some of his hymns at Autun to indicate to what degree he succeeded.

CORRESPONDING WITH BISHOPS: GOTTSCHALK'S *LIBELLUS* AND AMOLO OF LYONS' LETTER

A letter from Archbishop Amolo of Lyons (841–51) to Gottschalk, dateable 849–51, provides evidence that Gottschalk had been in contact with Amolo, and sent a revised version of his *Libellus* to bishops in the empire to convince them to preach his doctrine to their congregations.⁶⁹ According to Amolo, Gottschalk labeled Hrabanus and those who followed his doctrines “Hrabanian” heretics and sought to prove it with biblical and patristic authorities, indicating that he had revised his text as a response to his condemnation at the Synod of Mainz, possibly even while at Orbais before the Synod of Quierzy. Here Gottschalk's strategy was to test the orthodoxy of bishops absent from the synods in the hopes of finding supporters and challenging his condemnation.

As Archbishop of Lyons, Amolo held great potential as an ally for Gottschalk. For his see was home to Florus, one of the finest Augustinian scholars of the ninth century. Gottschalk probably hoped that Florus and his bishop would agree with his interpretation of the church father's doctrine and support him. As noted earlier, Florus became a severe critic of Hincmar and the Quierzy bishops in the 850s for their treatment of Gottschalk, and for their theology of predestination. Yet this development occurred only after Amolo's death in 851, who appears to have shared neither Florus' understanding of Augustine's thought nor the view that Gottschalk had been severely treated at Quierzy. Gottschalk was mistaken in believing that Amolo might support him, for the archbishop favored Hrabanus' doctrine, and

Fulda monk, from whom a similar text survives. See, Lambot, “Appendix III,” *CEG*, pp. 504–8; and Ermenric, *Epistola ad Grimaldum abbatem monasterii S. Galli*, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 536–79.

⁶⁷ Gottschalk, *Explanatio*, *CEG*, pp. 362–74.

⁶⁸ Jolivet, *Godescalc*, pp. 47–52, 65–74, 88–94, and 173–5; and Gillian Evans, “The Grammar of Predestination in the Ninth Century,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 33 (1982), pp. 134–45.

⁶⁹ Amolo, *Epistola* 2, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 368–78. As noted above, Devisse, *Hincmar*, p. 132 suggested this text was the *Confessio prolixior*, but this is unlikely since Gottschalk neither mentions Hrabanus specifically nor uses his neologism “Hrabanici” in the longer confession as Amolo discusses in his letter.

condemned Gottschalk sternly for his errors and his inexcusable disregard for episcopal authority.⁷⁰

Amolo did not attend the Synod of Quierzy, but he was informed of its proceedings by a monk who had been present, quite possibly the same witness described by Florus in his *Libellus de tribus epistolis*.⁷¹ Since Gottschalk was excommunicated, Amolo addressed the letter to him, but sent it to Hincmar.⁷² Amolo envisioned himself as the good Samaritan helping the wounded man in Christ's parable, perhaps making this comparison because he knew that Gottschalk had been beaten at the synod.⁷³ The bishop knew how Gottschalk had been in Germany, where he "sowed novelties and tossed foolish questions out into the open without discipline," suggesting Gottschalk's text was sent to him from Orbais.⁷⁴ He urged Gottschalk to be obedient, to respect the judgment of his elders, and to abandon his errors.⁷⁵ His critique of Gottschalk's teachings was akin to that of Hrabanus and Hincmar: he characterized them as "novelties" and argued that Gottschalk demeaned the sacraments and Christ's death by claiming that the damned were irrevocably predestined—a point that horrified the bishop.⁷⁶

According to Amolo, Gottschalk sent his work to bishops, encouraging them to preach his interpretation of divine predestination.⁷⁷ Gottschalk included biblical and patristic authorities to convince his audience that Augustine and the other fathers had taught twin predestination, and characterized his opponents as a new sect, the "Hrabanians" (*Hrabanici*):⁷⁸

Above all because you slander the priests of God and leaders of churches with such insults, abuses and curses—despising [them] with so much contumacy and obstinacy, assuredly and wretchedly deceived by the spirit of error and pride—you appear not at all to have Christian patience or reverence. For among other things, all who resist the insanity of your notions with the zeal of faith, you did not fear to call them heretics, and you presumed to name them "Hrabanians" after the good, learned and catholic bishop. You do not fear God because you fell through vain instability of mind and body, and through vainer curiosity and arrogance, into such great snares of the devil. You do not blush that you are caught and refuted in so many errors and lies by everyone everywhere. You do not grieve that you were indeed cut off for so many years from the body of the church with a punishment of just severity and that you remain bereft of all companionship and the solace of good things just as a useless stalk or a dry branch destined for the fire. But still your mouth is filled above all with malediction and bitterness, and "you are turned back into a crooked bow" [Ps 77, 57], not for the

⁷⁰ Mitterauer, *Gottschalk*, pp. 125–30; and Ganz, "Debate," p. 294.

⁷¹ Amolo, *Epistola 2*, *MGH Epp.* V, p. 369.

⁷² Amolo, *Epistola 2*, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 370–1.

⁷³ Amolo, *Epistola 2*, *MGH Epp.* V, p. 369.

⁷⁴ Amolo, *Epistola 2*, *MGH Epp.* V, p. 370: "novitates serere[t] et stultas ac sine disciplina questiones ventilare[t]."

⁷⁵ Amolo, *Epistola 2*, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 370–1.

⁷⁶ Amolo, *Epistola 2*, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 371–2 and 373–5.

⁷⁷ Amolo, *Epistola 2*, *MGH Epp.* V, p. 370; and Ganz, "Debate," p. 288.

⁷⁸ Amolo, *Epistola 2*, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 371, 372 and 376.

sake of the Lord, as you think, but, despising your mother church and its leaders, your fathers, with sacrilegious audacity, you strike against the Lord.⁷⁹

This passage from Amolo's letter is significant on at least two counts: first, it demonstrates that this bishop—a figure not connected with the Synods of Mainz and Quierzy—found Gottschalk's behavior totally reprehensible and his teachings to be heretical and insane; second, it shows that Gottschalk's approach in his *Libellus* was quite like that found in Hrabanus' predestination treatises: he stressed how his opponents were a heretical sect that must be avoided.

Amolo's response to Gottschalk is a revealing moment in the controversy. As a figure unconnected with the previous synodal decisions, and a Lotharingian bishop subordinate to neither Hrabanus nor Hincmar, he was a church leader persuaded that the synod's punishment of Gottschalk was proper. According to Amolo, Gottschalk had received his just deserts and he was shocked to find that he dared to continue in his errors and attacks against those who had condemned him. He used the words of Psalm 77, 57, "you are turned back in a crooked bow," to describe Gottschalk as one justly punished. The Psalm referred to Israelites who had abandoned God's covenant and consequently been reduced to nothing by divine wrath. According to Amolo, Gottschalk's contumacy had brought him to such a state. That Amolo described Gottschalk's actions as evidence of "sacrilegious audacity" suggests also that Gottschalk claimed in his *Libellus* that he was divinely inspired as he had in his *Confessio prolixior* and *Confessio brevior*. For Gottschalk to make such a claim in the face of his condemnation and punishment was to Amolo not only a sign of his pride and error, but also of absolute madness.

Amolo understood Gottschalk's actions as those of someone deluded by his mistaken, prideful belief that he was fighting for God's truth, and we have already seen how others such as Hincmar and Eriugena regarded Gottschalk's ideas and behavior to be evidence of insanity. To speak of heresy as madness (*insania*) was commonplace in the patristic era;⁸⁰ the tradition continued among early medieval

⁷⁹ Amolo, *Epistola* 2, *MGH Epp.* V, p. 377: "Unum quod sacerdotes Dei et rectores ecclesiarum tantis iniuriis et convitiis et maledictis laceras, tanto dispectu et contumacia conculcas, utique spiritu erroris et superbiae miserabiliter deceptus, ut omnino nihil christiane patientiae, nihil christianae reverentiae habere videaris. Nam inter cetera omnes, qui insaniae sensuum tuorum zelo fidei resistunt, hereticos appellare non metuis, eosque a bono et erudito atque catholico episcopo Rabanicos nuncupare presumis. Nec times Deum, quod in tales et tantos diaboli laqueos per vanam instabilitatem mentis et corporis, et vaniorem curiositatem atque arrogantiam incidisti. Nec erubescis, quod in tot erroribus et mendaciis ab omnibus ubique deprehenderis et confutaris. Nec doles, quod ecce tot annis a corpore ecclesiae iustae severitatis dampnatione precisus atque omni bonorum contubernio ac solatio defraudatus remansisti velut stirps inutilis et palmes aridus igni destinatus. Sed adhuc insuper os tuum maledictione et amaritudine plenum est, et conversus in arcum pravum, non pro Domino, ut putas, sed, ecclesiam matrem tuam eiusque presules patres tuos sacrilega audacia contempnens, adversus Dominum iacularis."

⁸⁰ Hilary, *De Trinitate*, V, 34 and VI, 10, ed. Smulders, pp. 187–8 and 205–7; Ambrose, *Explanatio psalmorum* xii, 39, ed. M. Petschenig, *CSEL* 64 (Vienna, 1919), p. 216; Jerome, *Commentariorum in Hiezechielem*, VII, 23 and X, 32, ed. François Glorie, *CCSL* 75 (Turnhout, 1964), pp. 306–7 and 463–4; and Augustine, *De baptismo contra Donatistas libri septem*, II, 3 and VII, 4, *PL* 43: 107–244, here 128 and 228.

writers like Gregory the Great, Isidore, and Bede;⁸¹ and remained common among their Carolingian successors—Paulinus of Aquileia, Hrabanus, Prudentius of Troyes, and Gottschalk himself to name a sample.⁸² Heresy was essentially “madness” because it was a perverted, self-destructive way of thinking that caused someone to become an enemy of Christ—heretics embraced diabolical delusions as truth and then stuck to those delusions even when correctly and logically shown the actual truth by their betters.⁸³ The key issue was that heretics’ ideas were regarded as self-evidently perverse and “unreasonable,” as Eriugena’s critique of Gottschalk’s proposed martyr ordeal discussed previously suggests, whereas the regime’s orthodox teachings were entirely logical and therefore “reasonable.” In this way, the view of heresy as madness, or unreasonableness, was similar to the idea of heresy as an incurable spiritual disease or contagion, or even as an “unreasonable” state of drunkenness as suggested by Gottschalk’s criticisms in his *Libellus* that Hrabanus had not read scripture and patristic texts “soberly.” Amolo understood Gottschalk’s predicament as the result of a process: he suffered from personal failings such as an unstable mind, vain curiosity, and arrogance, which led him to fall into heresy; but when he was caught and rightfully punished, he refused to accept this by his spiritual betters. For Amolo, both Gottschalk’s contumacy and his doctrine proved that he could only be in the wrong and, correspondingly, insane; the only correct and sane thing Gottschalk could do would be to remain silent as the bishops had ordered and accept correction.

Of course, one can turn Amolo’s critique of Gottschalk as “insane” around to demonstrate that he—just as his opponents—understood himself to be defending orthodoxy against heretics. As far as Gottschalk was concerned, knowing very well what Augustine had actually written in his anti-Pelagian writings and completely disregarding it would have been “insane.” From Gottschalk’s Augustinian perspective, his opponents *were* heretics. What is striking about Gottschalk’s approach, as best as we can gauge from Amolo’s letter, is that he characterized Hrabanus’ “heresy” as Hrabanus’ own dangerous novelty, even though he clearly knew in some cases the archbishop’s patristic sources (however dubious he judged some of them). Yet what mattered most was that Hrabanus was spreading his doctrine in the church—first in the eastern realm, and now in the western one—which Gottschalk sought to check with his *Libellus*. To emphasize Hrabanus as the source of the sect’s errors, Gottschalk named it after his enemy. In doing so, Gottschalk

⁸¹ Gregory, *Moralia in Job*, XIV, 4 and 6, ed. Adriaen, pp. 700–2; Isidore, *De viris illustribus*, 44, PL 83: 1081–1106, here 1105; and Bede, *In Ezram et Neemiam*, III, lines 1897–927, ed. David Hurst, CCSL 119A (Turnhout, 1969), pp. 386–3877.

⁸² Paulinus of Aquileia, *Contra Felicem Urgellitanum episcopum libri tres*, I, 50, PL 99: 343–468, here 406; Hrabanus, *Commentarium in Ezechielem*, IV, 23 and XII, 32, PL 110: 497–1084, here 742 and 829; Prudentius of Troyes, *De praedestinatione contra Joannem Scotum*, I, PL 115: 1009–366, here 1349; and Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, CEG, pp. 240, 247, and 253–4, here referring especially to ancient heresies.

⁸³ For discussion of this problem in later periods, see Sabina Flanagan, “Heresy, Madness and Possession in the High Middle Ages,” in *Heresy in Transition: Transforming Ideas of Heresy in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, eds. Ian Hunter, John Laursen, and Cary Nederman (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 29–41; and H.C. Erik Midelfort, *A History of Madness in Sixteenth-Century Germany* (Stanford, 1999), pp. 1–24.

was following the example of Benedict of Aniane, who had preferred to call the Adoptionist heresy after its founder, Felix of Urgel, labeling it the "Felician" heresy and its followers "Felicians."⁸⁴ This was a shift from Alcuin, who had compared Felix to the ancient heresiarch, Nestorius (ca. 381–451), who supposedly taught that Christ had been only a man and not divine.⁸⁵ Like Benedict, Gottschalk sought to discredit his opponents' doctrine as a new heresy to be placed on the lists of heresies (such as Hrabanus' own list in his *De clericorum institutione*) and eliminated.⁸⁶

The early medieval assumption that incurable or uncorrectable heresy was madness or a contagious disease is revealing in that it shows how what was deemed "unthinkable" was experienced in phenomenological terms. The disgust and loathing heretical ideas produced in those condemning them—emphasized especially through the discourse of horror and perversion—were joined with the disturbing sense of uncanniness in those same judges, who found themselves facing someone who refused to accept their seemingly well-reasoned claims about doctrine and what they saw as their well-intentioned, legitimate correction. Gottschalk's unreasonable refusal to recant and his imperviousness to reform made him a disturbing phenomenon: he was metaphorically a monstrous embodiment of evil, a sign or *monstrum* pointing to the failure of the imperial apparatus of correction. He had been contained, but not brought back to reason and redeemed through repentance. Even further, he was using imperial modes of theology and devotion in an effort to subvert the Carolingian system and cast the reforming bishops themselves as heretics.

HINCMAR, HRABANUS, AND THE PREDESTINATION DEBATE (849–51)

Hincmar's response to Gottschalk's activities in 849 and 850 took the form of his *Ad reclusos*, which he composed when he discovered that Gottschalk was sending texts outside of Hautvillers.⁸⁷ The archbishop's goal was to make two issues clear: Gottschalk was a dangerous and deceiving heretic, and he, along with his teachings,

⁸⁴ Benedict, *Disputatio adversus Felicianam impietatem*, PL 103: 1399–411; Cavadini, *Last Christology*, p. 128; and Chazelle, *Crucified*, pp. 64–5.

⁸⁵ Alcuin, *Liber contra haeresim*, 2, ed. Blumenshine, pp. 55–6; and Cavadini, *Last Christology*, pp. 1–9 and 84–6 for English translation of Alcuin's text. See also Allen Cabaniss, "The Heresiarch Felix," *Catholic Historical Review* 39 (1953), pp. 129–41; Wilhelm Heil, "Der Adoptionismus, Alcuin, und Spanien," in *Karl der Grosse: Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, ed. Bernhard Bischoff (Düsseldorf, 1965), II, pp. 94–155; Gary Blumenshine, "Alcuin's *Liber Contra Haeresim Felicis* and the Frankish Kingdom," *Frühmittelalterlichen Studien* 17 (1983), pp. 222–33; and Cavadini, *Last Christology*, pp. 45–103. On Nestorius, see Susan Ashbrook Harvey, "Nestorius," in *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, ed. Everett Ferguson, 2nd ed. (New York, 1997), II, pp. 809–10.

⁸⁶ See also Gottschalk, *Confessio prolixior*, *CEG*, p. 70 for his description of those who do not believe in twin predestination as heretics. Hrabanus' list was based on one from Isidore of Seville; see Hrabanus, *De institutione*, II, 58, ed. Zimpel, II, pp. 430–52, and Isidore, *Etymologiae*, VIII, 5, ed. Lindsay.

⁸⁷ Hincmar, *Ad reclusos*, ed. Gundlach, pp. 261–2.

had been canonically condemned.⁸⁸ Like Hrabanus, Hincmar's most fundamental theological position was that baptism restored one's free will, and he wanted to be sure that the clerics and monks of his diocese understood this central point.⁸⁹ Also like Hrabanus, Hincmar sought to discredit Gottschalk as a pseudoprophet.⁹⁰ In this way the archbishop reached back into the scriptural past in order to counter Gottschalk's adoption of ancient Christian typologies for defending his ideas and behavior. Yet facing Gottschalk's ongoing dissent and contumacy, Hincmar went into much greater detail into the history and psychology of evil (alluded to by Amolo in his letter) in order to explain both how temptation, sin, and corruption worked, and how Gottschalk as a pseudoprophet constituted a very special and most dangerous type of Satanic minion. Hincmar began with the devil:

The blessed Peter, highest pastor of the Lord's sheepfold, says "that our enemy the devil circles just as a roaring lion, seeking someone to devour" [I Pet 5:8], that is to say desiring to produce some heretic from the unity of the church so that he might more easily seize someone and join him to the ruin of his own depravity; and since he cannot deceive by his own occult persuasion and he dare not show himself in his nature to human sight—because we must all flee, become wholly terrified, and curse him and repel [him] with the power of the sign of the cross and the invocation of Christ—"he transforms himself into an angel of light" [II Cor 11:24] and seeks instruments and vessels, subjected to him through wicked acts and by their own will and known to us through their nature, from whom he himself speaks, persuades, and gives us to imbibe examples of perversion to destroy us.⁹¹

Several points require discussion here. Chief among these is that the devil seeks agents among those already subjected to him through their own evil acts and perverted will, but he appears to them in a heavenly guise as an "angel of light" in order to seduce them into spreading error. Here Hincmar borrowed this Pauline image especially to counter Gottschalk's claims of orthodoxy and devotion. In this way, the wicked were tricked into doing even greater evil, and this evil was all the more dangerous because as heresy it took the deceptive form of "true" doctrine. According to such logic, these instruments and vessels spoke for the devil, adding as it were an outside echo to the devil's inner temptations in every human mind in order to persuade their fellow human beings to do evil by their example. In this way, Hincmar argued that these demonic agents were most essential to the devil's

⁸⁸ Gundlach, "Zwei Schriften," p. 258.

⁸⁹ For Hincmar on predestination, see Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 214–68; and Chazelle, *The Crucified God*, pp. 181–95. See also Dutton, *Politics of Dreaming*, pp. 130–2.

⁹⁰ Dutton, *The Politics of Dreaming*, pp. 131–2.

⁹¹ Hincmar, *Ad reclusos*, ed. Gundlach, pp. 258–9: "Beatus Petrus, summus pastor ovilis dominici, dicit: Quia adversarius vester diabolus sicut leo rugiens circuit, quaerens quem devoret, scilicet de unitate ecclesiae cupiens erroneum quemlibet reddere, ut eum valeat facilius rapere et perditioni sue nequitiae sotiare; et quoniam sua occulta persuasione non potest decipere et in sua se natura humanis visibus non audet ostendere, quia scit, quoniam omnes eum debuissemus refugere, pertimescere et abominari et cum virtute signali crucis et invocationis Christi repellere, transfiguratur se in angelum lucis et querit organa et vasa sua, per maligna opera et voluntate propria sibi subdita ac nobis per naturam cognata, unde ipse loquens atque suadens et exempla perditionis propinans nos valeat perdere."

designs for human destruction and, therefore, they were to be understood as exceptionally dangerous.

After the passage quoted above, Hincmar then explained that the devil, envious of humanity, took the form of a serpent and seduced the “softer and simpler” (*mollior et simplicior*) Eve who helped him to tempt Adam, which resulted in procreation and the creation of human sinfulness.⁹² According to this logic, Eve was the original demonic agent. The devil’s methods of temptation began in the mind with suggestions, which then led to temptation through pleasures of the flesh. If these temptations were not resisted and a person acted on them, then that person became shamelessly bound to the devil and arrogantly “ensnared in the chains of sins” (*vinculis peccatorum inretitus*). Soon the sinner moved from doing secret sins to perpetrating public crimes shamelessly, and then they spread their wicked deeds after having been overwhelmed by the illusions of a “wretched security” (*misera securitas*)—meaning what Hincmar must have thought was their misguided sense of immunity from punishment—or through a sense of “lethal desperation” (*letalitatis desperatio*) as a lost and ruined soul. Such sinners were the devil’s obedient agents in their habits, their deeds, and in their “perverse doctrine” (*perversa doctrina*), in every way obeying his secret suggestions, performing “depraved acts,” and deceiving others. Out of such sinners, Hincmar warned, the devil created pseudochrists and pseudoprophets, of whom according to scripture there was no counting. With a host of additional biblical quotations, Hincmar reminded his readers how the apostles had warned the church about pseudoprophets and deceiving masters creating “sects of ruin” (*sectae perditionis*) that deny Christ and are driven by greed (II Pet 2:1–3), about the many impious antichrists seeking gain instead of grace and denying Christ (Jud 4), about those erring and leading others into error (II Tim 3:13), and about those adulterating the word of God, while serving their bellies rather than their divine Lord (II Cor 2:17 and Rom 16:18).⁹³

Then Hincmar revealed that Gottschalk was precisely such a demonic agent:

And of men like this there arose in our diocese a certain Gottschalk, known to you by name, appearance and way of life and now known to me at first by his rotten reputation for wretched talk and by the abomination of his perverse preaching, and now at last face-to-face and by his manner of most stubborn obstinacy. Before he was excommunicated, as I have heard, he left his diocese against the laws of the church living wickedly, to appearance monastic in habit and manner commending himself as if he were respectable to your ears and eyes, but veiling the depravity of his heart by his zeal, pouring out the worst venom into your ears and at the same time your hearts . . . ⁹⁴

⁹² Hincmar, *Ad reclusos*, ed. Gundlach, p. 259.

⁹³ Hincmar, *Ad reclusos*, ed. Gundlach, p. 260.

⁹⁴ Hincmar, *Ad reclusos*, ed. Gundlach, pp. 260–1: “Et de talibus surrexit quidam in diocesi nostra vobis notus et nomine et facie et conversatione, Gotescalcus, nobis autem iam olim fama putrida miserae conversationis et abominatione perverse predicationis et nunc tandem facie et sermone pertinacissime obstinationis cognitus, qui, ut audivi, antequam ex ista parrochia contra leges ecclesiasticas excommunicatus pergeret male vivens, habitu et sermone, ut videbatur, religioso se quasi honestum auribus et aspectibus vestris commendans, pravitatem sui cordis [zelo] pallians, venena pessima auditibus simul et cordibus vestris infudit . . .”

Key here was that Gottschalk's appearance and manner formed a diabolical ruse: they hid his true nature and the dangers presented by his teachings. His heart was depraved and in the devil's service, so that when he poured forth his spiritually lethal teachings from his heart, he corrupted and perverted his listeners' hearts. In this sense, Hincmar was repeating the theme of Gottschalk's contagion: his inner perversity and enslavement to the devil were passed on through contact, and his heresy was a spiritual disease leading to ruin. Hincmar also juxtaposed Gottschalk's current wicked reputation and the fact of his excommunication with his readers' former understanding of him as a pious monastic teacher. Emphasizing his own personal encounter with the heretic as further proof that his true nature had been revealed, Hincmar's goal was to make his readers identify Gottschalk with the diabolical plot to lead humanity into ruin through carefully-selected agents spreading error while wearing a pious guise.

Hincmar then indicated that Gottschalk had sent out at least three texts known to the archbishop: one was sent to Giselmars of Corbie, written in prayer-like form in order to win praise, which "he took care to compile falsely from scripture" (*falso de scripturis compilare curavit*) and filled with "blasphemies" (*blasphemiae*); a second attacked Hrabanus and was filled with passages from accepted authorities that "he either mutilated or corrupted" (*aut mutilavit aut corrupit*)—this seems to have been the text Gottschalk sent to Amolo, who then forwarded it to Hincmar; and a third, which we already argued was his *Confessio prolixior*, was a tome small in quantity, but greatest in impiety that he personally received from Gottschalk.⁹⁵ Apparently Hincmar was unaware of Gottschalk's correspondence with Ratramnus. While the archbishop's description of the text sent to Giselmars sounds like it could be Gottschalk's *Confessio prolixior*, the surviving fragments do not match that or any other text from his corpus.⁹⁶ The archbishop warned his readers to avoid these and other writings, and his great concern was that Gottschalk—a "serpent in the grass" (*anguis in herba*)—was trying to pervert his readers' "monastic simplicity" (*religiosa simplicitas*) at the devil's instigation by getting them to abandon what was most fundamental to Carolingian spiritual health: humility and repentance.⁹⁷ In order to prove his argument, Hincmar (like Hrabanus) included lengthy citations of patristic texts and then appended Gottschalk's canonical sentence to his treatise in order to make his status as a defrocked and excommunicated priest clear.⁹⁸

The effect of Hincmar's work in his archdiocese overall is difficult to gauge, but one important result was that Ratramnus presented a formidable critique of its doctrine in his *cartula*, propelling the debate even further.⁹⁹ As a result of this setback, Hincmar sought out the advice of other scholars, hoping to counter Ratramnus' criticisms and Gottschalk's teachings in general. Yet the result again

⁹⁵ Hincmar, *Ad reclusos*, ed. Gundlach, pp. 261–2.

⁹⁶ See *Ad reclusos*, ed. Gundlach, p. 271 and Gottschalk, *Fragmentum* 1, *CEG*, pp. 9–10.

⁹⁷ Hincmar, *Ad reclusos*, ed. Gundlach, p. 262. "Anguis in herba" is an allusion to Vergil, *Ecloga*, III, 93, ed. R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969), p. 9.

⁹⁸ For further discussion of this text, Hincmar's doctrine and comparisons with Hrabanus' teaching, see Chazelle, *The Crucified God*, pp. 184–95.

⁹⁹ Evidence for the *cartula* comes from Hrabanus, *Epistola* 43, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 487–9, here 488.

was a widening of the debate with a growing number of opinions.¹⁰⁰ Lupus of Ferrières responded with a letter explaining his views on predestination to Hincmar, in which (as in his response to Gottschalk discussed already) he avoided siding either with Gottschalk or the archbishop.¹⁰¹ He also composed a work on predestination, the *Liber de tribus quaestionibus*, and wrote a letter to Charles the Bald explaining his views on the subject after seeing him at Bourges in December, 849 or January, 850.¹⁰² Bishop Prudentius of Troyes also responded to Hincmar's inquiry with a collection of patristic excerpts.¹⁰³ Both Lupus and Prudentius took strong positions that accounted for Augustine's teachings on predestination, although they did not identify with Gottschalk.¹⁰⁴ Hincmar also asked John Eriugena, one of Charles the Bald's favorites, to respond to Gottschalk's *Confessio proluxior*, which produced a different but equally controversial interpretation of predestination.¹⁰⁵

In the spring of 850 Hincmar's anxiety about Gottschalk's influence in the archdiocese and his growing sense of uncertainty about how to deal with it led him to seek help from a trustworthy source: Hrabanus. He asked the Archbishop of Mainz to help him resolve the problems that Gottschalk's teachings, Ratramnus' criticisms, and the mushrooming of scholarly opinions were creating. As Gangolf Schrimpf and Raymund Kottje have noted, Hincmar appears to have viewed the Archbishop of Mainz as the senior theologian and the doctrinal authority in the dispute.¹⁰⁶ Hincmar's correspondence is lost, but Hrabanus responded with two letters in the spring of 850. In the first, Hrabanus noted that Hincmar had sent him his own *Ad reclusos*, Prudentius of Troyes' letter, Gottschalk's "rubbish" (*nugae*)—probably his *Confessio proluxior*—and Ratramnus' *cartula* in the hope that he would comment on them.¹⁰⁷ Hrabanus complained that he was too weary to do so with a lengthy treatise, and did not address any of the writings he received.¹⁰⁸ He did, however, warn Hincmar that Gottschalk should not be allowed to receive the Eucharist or participate in divine worship at Hautvillers unless he gave up his teachings on predestination.¹⁰⁹ This last point indicates that the judgment of silence imposed on Gottschalk was not seen in absolute terms even by Hrabanus. Instead, the significance of the sentence seems to have been to encourage Gottschalk to give up his views, for which he would be restored to communion.

Hrabanus' second letter, however, soon followed and included a discussion of predestination, a critique of Ratramnus and Gottschalk, and a severe rebuke of

¹⁰⁰ Ganz, "Debate," p. 289.

¹⁰¹ Lupus, *Epistula* 130. *Ad Hincmarum praesulem*, ed. Marshall, pp. 122–4.

¹⁰² Lupus, *Epistula* 131. *Ad domnum regem*, ed. Marshall, pp. 124–8 and id., *Liber de tribus quaestionibus*, PL 119: 619–48.

¹⁰³ Prudentius, *Epistola ad Hincmarum et Pardulum*, PL 115: 971–1010.

¹⁰⁴ Ganz, "Predestination Debate," p. 289; and Wiefelaert, *Prudentius*, pp. 130–73.

¹⁰⁵ Schrimpf, "Der Beitrag," pp. 819–65; id., *Das Werk*, pp. 72–131; Marenbon, "John Scottus," pp. 303–25; Zechiel-Eckes, *Florus*, pp. 90–118; and Crouse, "Predestination," pp. 303–11.

¹⁰⁶ Schrimpf, "Hraban," pp. 150–2; and Raymund Kottje, "Zu den Beziehungen zwischen Hincmar von Reims und Hrabanus Maurus," in *CB*, pp. 235–40.

¹⁰⁷ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 43, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 487–9, here 488.

¹⁰⁸ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 43, *MGH Epp.* V, p. 488.

¹⁰⁹ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 43, *MGH Epp.* V, p. 489.

Hincmar for his laxity in handling the matter.¹¹⁰ Hrabanus' discussion of predestination did not differ from his previous writings, and he even sent his two earlier treatises—the works sent to Noting and Eberhard—to explain the relevant issues further.¹¹¹ He attacked Ratramnus, whom he referred to as “that monk of Corbie” (*ille Corbegensis monachus*), for disparaging Hincmar and for his criticisms of Hincmar's text. He also defended the Archbishop of Rheims' use of the dubious *De induratione cordis Pharaonis*, a text that Hrabanus attributed to Jerome, and claimed that Ratramnus had misrepresented Fulgentius' *De veritate praedestinationis*.¹¹² Hrabanus' critique of the monk was meant to reassure Hincmar of the orthodoxy of his position, and that he need not worry about such criticisms.

Yet Hrabanus severely censured Hincmar for his handling of Gottschalk and for allowing the predestination issue to develop into a wider controversy. In the tradition of *admonitio*, he blamed the archbishop himself for the further spread of Gottschalk's teachings:

I, however, to the extent I presume to do so, admonish you to prohibit these harmful contests from happening among the Christian people, and not to permit Gottschalk, the author of this error, to harm others further either by writing or speaking. For I marvel at your wisdom, that you permitted this harmful man, that is Gottschalk—who is found blameworthy in everything, who legitimately observed neither the monk's vow, nor the rite of holy orders, nor even the office of preaching—to write anything, in which action he could do more damage than by speaking in person. Already in many places, as I have heard, he has inebriated not a few with the cup of his venom, and turned them to the insanity of error . . . About all this it seems good to me, if it so pleases you, that neither occasion nor permission to write be given this heretic, nor to dispute with someone before (if it is even possible) his mind and understanding have returned to catholic doctrine . . . And pay attention! How are you supposed to be without fault, you who condemned this unspeakable sect at the same time with this heretic in your synod, if you communicate with him in an incorrect manner? For you ought to be a corrector of evils, not a follower of those in error . . .¹¹³

¹¹⁰ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 44, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 490–9.

¹¹¹ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 44, *MGH Epp.* V, p. 490.

¹¹² Hrabanus, *Epistola* 44, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 492–3. On the Pelagian work, see Georges de Plinval, *Essai sur le style et la langue de Pélagie, suivi du traité inédit. De induratione cordis Pharaonis* (Friburg, 1947); and Flavio Nuvolone-Nobile, “Problèmes d'une nouvelle édition du *De Induratione Cordis Pharaonis* attribué à Pélagie,” *Revue des études Augustiniennes* 26 (1980), pp. 105–17. Ratramnus' reading of Fulgentius appears to have been correct; see Fulgentius, *De veritate praedestinationis*, III, 8, ed. Fraipont, pp. 526–7.

¹¹³ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 44, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 496–8: “Ego autem, quantum presumo, vos ammono, ut has contentiones noxias in populo christiano fieri prohibeatis, et ipsum Gotescalcum, huius erroris auctorem, nec scribendo, nec loquendo ultra tam multis nocere permittatis. Miror enim prudentiam vestram, quod istum noxium virum, hoc est Gotescalcum, qui in omnibus vituperabilis inventus est, qui nec monachi votum, nec sacri ordinis ritum, sed neque predicandi officium legitime observavit, scribere aliquid permisistis, in quo officio magis nocere potuit quam viva voce loquendo. Unde etiam in plurimis locis, ut audivi, sui veneni poculo non paucos inebriavit, et in erroris insaniam vertit. . . . Unde mihi bonum videtur, si vobis ita placet, quod . . . heretico nulla detur occasio atque licentia scribendi, atque cum aliquo disputandi, antequam, si possibile sit, eius mens et sensus ad catholicam redeat doctrinam. Et attendite, quomodo vos sine crimine possitis esse, qui in sinodo vestra hanc sectam nefandam simul cum heretico dampnastis, si ei modo incorrecto communicaveritis. Debetis enim correctores malorum, non secutores errantium . . .”

Hrabanus' position as Hincmar's senior is most evident here, and this rebuke is even harsher than the one sent in his letter to Eberhard, when he blamed the count for allowing Gottschalk's "sect" to flourish. Hrabanus was clearly concerned about Gottschalk's contagion, especially since Hincmar had not managed to prevent him from spreading his "venomous" ideas by writing or speaking with people. Hrabanus also emphasized the theme of Gottschalk's "drunkenness" and "insanity," which seems here especially focused on his continued persistence in error and his disturbing resistance to correction. The letter reveals quite clearly Hincmar's uncertainty about how to control the situation created by Gottschalk's condemnation. That the sentence of silence had not been strictly enforced now appeared to be a terrible mistake that would prove difficult to correct.

Hrabanus also directed his ire against his old enemy, focusing on the *Confessio prolixior* and Gottschalk's proposed *examen*. He was outraged by Gottschalk's style and, seeing the fiery ordeal as a reference to the story of the three boys and the fiery furnace in the Book of Daniel, he viewed the trial as further evidence of his former pupil's pride and obstinacy:

In this matter too, the same erroneous man, as if speaking to God, seeks an ordeal of fire to prove the verity of his faith, or rather perfidy, which appears to me more to have been offered out of elation of heart than out of constancy of faith. For he hopes, after the blasphemy which he brought forth from his impudent mouth, that it be permitted for him—in the presence of the multitude of the people gathered from everywhere, with the prince of the realm present, and at the same time with the body of bishops and priests, and monks and canons—to prove his sect to himself by passing over four barrels placed one after another and individually filled with boiling water, oil, lard and pitch and finally a massive fire being lit, so that the truth of his profession might be proved: which I read that no one, save him, ever hoped to do. For the three boys, about whom it is written in Daniel (that is Shadrak, Mishak and Abednago) sought an ordeal of fire not with the same obstinacy, but rather holding all things to the judgment of God, responded to the King of Babylon, who was compelling them to adore the golden statue which he made, and said: "It is not necessary that we answer you about this matter. For behold our God, whom we worship, can save us from the furnace of burning fire, and free us from your hands. But if he is unwilling to do so, may it be known to you, king, that we do not worship your gods, and we do not adore the golden statue which you erected" [Dan 3, 16–18]. For thus they merited being freed from the fire out of steadfastness of faith and humility of profession, while his obstinacy, which should have an end, confirms that he is still ignorant.¹¹⁴

¹¹⁴ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 44, *MGH Epp.* V, pp. 498–9: "Hoc autem quod idem erroneus, quasi ad Deum loquens, petit examen ignis, ut per illud veritas eius fidei, immo perfidiae, comprobetur, magis mihi videtur ex elatione cordis prolutum esse, quam ex constantia fidei. Optat enim, post blasphemiam, quam impudenti ore protulit, ut coram undique collecta populorum multitudine, praesente etiam regni principe, simul cum pontificum et sacerdotum, monachorumque sive canonicorum agmine ad probandam suam sectam liceat sibi, quatuor doliis uno post unum positis, atque singillatim repletis aqua ferventi, oleo pingui, et pice, et ultime accenso igne copiosissimo, ad probandam traditionem suam transire, ut sic probetur eius professionis veritas: quod neminem preter eum ita optasse legi. Nam tres pueri, de quibus in Daniele scriptum est, hoc est Sidrac, Misac et Abednago, non simili pertinentia examen ignis petierunt, sed magis Dei iudicio omnia servantes, responderunt regi Babilonis, qui eos statuam auream quam fecit adorare compulsi et dixerunt: 'Non oportet nos de hac re respondere tibi.

Hrabanus criticized Gottschalk's prayer-like style, apparently not realizing that it was done in emulation of Augustine's *Confessiones* (which he would not have appreciated), as evidence of false piety. In his eyes Gottschalk was still a disobedient blasphemer, so his prayers and requests for a trial could only be further evidence of pride, not humility—although pride of a most disturbing and uniquely heretical kind for their era. Unable to fathom Gottschalk as a martyr, Hrabanus emphasized that the boys in the Daniel story did not worship the pagan gods, and would not do so, whether God saved them from the flames or not. Yet Gottschalk's certainty—however humbly stated—that God would save him to prove his doctrine only made him appear more guilty to Hrabanus. Hrabanus also characterized Gottschalk's ordeal as illegitimate because of its seeming uniqueness, while he contrasted the boys' constancy of faith and humility of profession with his opponent's supposed obstinacy in error and prideful profession. While Gottschalk prayed for true humility from God, Hrabanus could only see his unwillingness to accept correction, which seemed to the archbishop to be above all evidence of sin and heresy.

Following Hrabanus' second letter, it appears that he and Hincmar worked jointly to convince their kings to take resolute action against anyone supporting Gottschalk—efforts that culminated in the assembly of Meerssen in the spring of 851.¹¹⁵ This gathering was the result of efforts by Charles the Bald, Louis the German, and Lothar to establish a general sense of harmony and cooperation between themselves and their magnates.¹¹⁶ This event was part of a process by which Carolingian realms sought to establish a peaceful coexistence based on the notion of the rulers' "brotherly affection" and to reestablish episcopal authority through synodal activity and correction.¹¹⁷ At the gathering, the kings and their nobles made the following resolution, which appears to be related to Gottschalk and his teachings:

IV. And because the peace and quiet of the realm tend to be disturbed by wandering and disrespectful men, we wish that to whomever of us such a man comes, wishing to flee reason and justice regarding those things he did, none of us should receive or keep him for any other purpose except to bring him to true reason and needed correction; and if he should flee true reason, all in common, into whomever's kingdom he should come, one should pursue him, until either he has been led to reason or eliminated from the realm.¹¹⁸

Ecce enim Deus noster, quem colimus, potest eripere nos de camino ignis ardentis, et de manibus tuis liberare. Quod si noluerit, notum tibi sit, rex, quia deos tuos non colimus, et statuam auream quam erexisti non adoramus.' Sic enim illi ex fidei firmitate et professionis humilitate de igne liberari meruerunt, pertinacia autem istius quem finem habeat, ignotum adhuc constat."

¹¹⁵ Ganz, "Debate," p. 297 and Diem, "Verstoorder," pp. 125–31, who especially point to the connection between Gottschalk and the Assembly of Meerssen.

¹¹⁶ Goldberg, *Struggle*, pp. 154–6.

¹¹⁷ Costambeys et al., *The Carolingian World*, pp. 388–94; Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, pp. 132–70; Goldberg, *Struggle for Empire*, pp. 148–56; and Kershaw, *Peaceful Kings*, pp. 209–12.

¹¹⁸ *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 851, ed. Grat et al., pp. 61–2: "IV. Et quia per vagos et inreverentes homines pax et tranquillitas regni perturbari solet, volumus ut ad quemcumque nostrum talis venerit et de his quae egit rationem et iustitiam subterfugere velit, nemo ex nobis illum ad aliud recipiat vel retineat, nisi ut ad rectam rationem et debitam emendationem perducatur; et si rationem rectam subterfugerit, omnes in commune, in cuius regnum venerit, illum persequamur, donec aut ad rationem perducatur aut de regno deleatur."

The intended effect of this legislation was to reflect the solidarity of the three monarchs and their notables on the issue of Gottschalk or figures like him. "Rogue" theologians were labeled disturbers of the peace in any of the three kingdoms, although what "eliminating" them from the realm was supposed to mean is unclear. Such figures were to be reformed and brought to "reason," or presumably contained for the safety of the church. This decision, however, did not mean that the kings and their bishops would remain in agreement. In 855 Lothar's bishops present at Valence criticized Hincmar's doctrine of predestination from the Synod of Quierzy (853), when Charles' growing power gave the predestination debate greater political resonance.¹¹⁹ The legislation from Meerssen, however, appears to have come too late to have had an impact on Gottschalk's limited circle of supporters and readers, for whom he continued to write after 851.

GOTTSCHALK AS EXILE AT HAUTVILLERS:

UT QUID IUBES

While the Assembly of Meerssen condemned Gottschalk and anyone who might follow his example of disobedience, Gottschalk portrayed himself at Hautvillers in the hymn *Ut quid iubes* as an exile comforted by a young companion, who reminded him of his need to praise Christ.¹²⁰ *Ut quid iubes'* theme of exile and its level of introspection for a ninth-century poem have brought it to the attention of scholars more than the rest of Gottschalk's poetry.¹²¹ While various dates have been suggested for its composition, the text was most likely written two years after Gottschalk was sent to Hautvillers, as Thomas Ehlen has recently suggested.¹²² In this sense, it was Gottschalk's response to the Assembly of Meerssen's confirmation of his imprisonment, and in it he characterized his incarceration as a Babylonian captivity. Yet the image of his exile was not wholly without comfort, since his young companion provided him with fraternal charity—a central feature of monastic friendship extending back to the patristic era—as he prayed that Christ

¹¹⁹ *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 853, ed. Grat et al., p. 67; *MGH Conc.* III, No. 33 [Valence, 855], 1–6, pp. 352–7; Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 126–36; Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 214–23; and Ganz, "Debate," pp. 297–8.

¹²⁰ Gottschalk, *Ut quid iubes*, *PLAC* III, pp. 731–2; Bischoff, "Gottschalks Lied," pp. 64–5; and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 147–51. See also Dinkler, *Gottschalk* pp. 67–71 for a German translation of the poem by Erwin Wißmann.

¹²¹ Thomas Ehlen, "Bilder des Exils—das Exil als Bild. Ästhetik und Bewältigung in lyrischen Texten," in *Exil, Fremdheit und Ausgrenzung im Mittelalter*, ed. Andreas Bihrer, Sven Limbeck, and Paul Gerhard Schmidt (Würzburg, 2000), pp. 151–232, here pp. 193–208; Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 234–46; Brunhölzl, *Geschichte*, p. 363; Szövérfly, *Weltliche Dichtungen des lateinischen Mittelalters: Ein Handbuch. I. Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende der Karolingerzeit* (Berlin, 1970), pp. 593–4; id., *Annalen*, pp. 243–4; Bischoff, "Gottschalks Lied," pp. 61–8; F.J.E. Raby, *A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages*, vol. I, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1957), p. 227; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 85–7; F.J.E. Raby, *A History of Christian-Latin Poetry from the Beginnings to the Close of the Middle Ages*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1953), pp. 191–2; and Traube, *PLAC* III, p. 712.

¹²² Ehlen, "Bilder," p. 206. For previous arguments see: Traube, *PLAC* III, p. 712; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 85–7; Bischoff, "Gottschalks Lied," 61–8; von Moos, "*O mi custos*," p. 339; and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 244–6.

would rescue him.¹²³ It is also worth noting that this hymn appears not only in a ninth-century Autun manuscript, suggesting that Jonas may have been sympathetic with Gottschalk and his ideas at that time, but also in four additional ninth or tenth-century manuscripts from western Francia.¹²⁴ Such an impressive number of surviving copies of the hymn implies quite strongly that *Ut quid iubes* circulated in the archdiocese among those in communication with Gottschalk.

The poem consists of thirteen stanzas of six lines each.¹²⁵ In the text Gottschalk addressed alternately his young companion—whom he referred to as “little boy” (*pusiolus*), “little son” (*filiolus*), “little brother” (*fraterculus*)—and Christ, both of whom asked him to sing for them despite the dejection caused by his exile.¹²⁶ Gottschalk compared himself to the Israelites in Babylon, and expressed his preference for mourning rather than singing.¹²⁷ Yet he ultimately acquiesced to the divine command and sang God’s praise with his young companion while waiting for deliverance.¹²⁸

Dating the poem to 851 is possible based on evidence within the text itself.¹²⁹ Of particular interest is how Gottschalk wrote that he had been in “exile” for two years, and noted that God’s “true sect” had a “fuller faith,” referring to himself and those who believed in twin predestination:

9. For some little time I have been an exile
On this sea, Lord,
You know it has been almost two years now:
Do at long last
Take pity.
This I ask most humbly.
10. For I am full of sin,
O best of kings,
I know and confess that
The true sect has a fuller faith.
This I believe most firmly.¹³⁰

¹²³ Marie Aquinas McNamara, *Friendship in Saint Augustine* (Friburg, 1958); Adele Fiske, “Alcuin and Mystical Friendship,” *Studi Medievali* 3 (1961), pp. 551–75; ead., *Friends and Friendship in the Monastic Tradition* (Cuernavaca, MX: 1970), pp. 1–24; Brown, *Cult*, pp. 50–68; McGuire, *Friendship*, pp. 38–133; Carolinne White, *Christian Friendship in the Fourth Century* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 164–217; and Le Jan, “Le lien social,” pp. 528–46.

¹²⁴ The additional manuscripts are Angers, Bibliothèque Municipale, 477 (461) (ninth century); Montpellier, Faculté de Médecine, H 219 (tenth century); Paris, B.N.F. MS lat. 1154 (ninth-tenth century); and Paris, B.N.F. MS lat. 12140 (tenth century). Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 83–5, 99–100, 101–5, and 107–9 discusses the manuscripts.

¹²⁵ Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 78–9.

¹²⁶ Gottschalk, *Ut quid iubes*, verses 1–3, *PLAC* III, pp. 731–2.

¹²⁷ Gottschalk, *Ut quid iubes*, verses 1, 2, 4, and 6, *PLAC* III, pp. 731–2.

¹²⁸ Gottschalk, *Ut quid iubes*, verse 10, *PLAC* III, p. 732 and Weber, *Gedichte*, p. 151.

¹²⁹ Ehlen, “Bilder,” p. 206.

¹³⁰ Gottschalk, *Ut quid iubes*, verses 9–10, *PLAC* III, p. 732 and Weber, *Gedichte*, p. 150: “[9] Exul ego diuscule/ Hoc in mare sum, domine,/ Annos nempe duos fere/ Nosti fore sed iamiamque/ Miserere./ Hoc rogo humillime. [10] Plenus enim facinore/ Ego sum, o rex optime,/ Pleniorem sectae verae/ Pietatem novi esse/ Fateorque./ Hoc credo firmissime.” Translation adapted from *Poetry*, trans. Godman, pp. 230–2.

While the image of exile on the sea was a common motif in early Christian and early medieval literature, Gottschalk's reference to two years of exile does not seem to be a textual allusion.¹³¹ His concern to associate himself with Christ's true sect indicates that it was written after his struggle with Hrabanus and Hincmar had begun. That Gottschalk also referred to the "triune and one God" (*trinus et unus deus*) in the poem, which was a phrase he used after his incarceration at Orbais and Hautvillers in his *Confessio prolixior* and *O mi custos*, indicates that 851 is the most likely date of composition.¹³²

As a response to the Assembly of Meersen, Gottschalk's *Ut quid iubes* offered an alternate image of himself as a suffering exile from that of the assembly, which characterized him as a wandering and disrespectful breaker of the peace. Gottschalk stressed his terrible condition, writing: "You know I have long been in exile, I suffer much day and night" (*scis . . . /hic diu me exulare, / multa die sive noctel tolerare*), and emphasized—in typical Carolingian fashion—the foreign nature of heresy by claiming that his companion wanted him to sing "Before the people of a land foreign to ours" (*coram gentel aliene nostri terre*), though Israel had not been called upon to sing in Babylon.¹³³ Gottschalk's sense of exile and alienation in the land of heretics was joined with a confession of his sinfulness and a request for ultimate deliverance from persecution among the reprobate: "Have mercy on me now, Lord . . . and remember your servant, I ask with a humble heart" (*miserere iam, dominel . . . famulique . . . memorare. / Prono posco pectore*), "lead me back most quickly . . . I do not wish to be here any longer . . . this I ask most of all" (*Reduc me velocissimel . . . Nolo hic me magis essel . . . Hoc rogo praecipue*).¹³⁴ While Gottschalk's confessional and doctrinal writings continued to emphasize his heroic resistance, these verses stressed his sense of misery, isolation, and sorrow in that same position. His pleas for deliverance remind the reader that his sufferings in the present would be rewarded in heaven, and that the elect continually confess their sinfulness and need for grace along with their desires for relief from evil.

Despite this evident suffering, Gottschalk was able to take solace not only in being faithful to his God, but also from his young monastic supporters. In this sense, the poem gave artistic expression to Gottschalk's interactions with the young monks at Hautvillers, which corresponds well with Hincmar's later descriptions of Gottschalk's success with young monks. Hincmar complained in 856–7 that Gottschalk was especially influential with young brothers, and in the 860s he noted that the young Guntbert "had often met secretly with Gottschalk, giving him letters and receiving them from him."¹³⁵ In the hymn, Gottschalk and his

¹³¹ Ehlen, "Bilder," pp. 203–5.

¹³² Gottschalk, *Ut quid iubes*, verse 8, *PLAC* III, p. 731; id., *Confessio prolixior*, *CEG*, p. 76; and id., *O mi custos*, st. 14, 24, 27 and 55, *PLAC* VI, pp. 90–2 and 95.

¹³³ Gottschalk, *Ut quid iubes*, verses 4–6, *PLAC* III, p. 732; and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 148–9.

¹³⁴ Gottschalk, *Ut quid iubes*, verses 11–12, *PLAC* III, p. 732; and Weber, *Gedichte*, pp. 150–1.

¹³⁵ Hincmar, *De una et non trina deitate*, *PL* 125: 473–618, here 613–14; and id., *Epistola* 187, *MGH Epp.* VIII, pp. 194–5: "saepe Gothescalco furtim se conjunxerat, et litteras ei dederat, et ab eo acceperat."

companion play different, but equally significant roles which point to a new dynamic in his life. Gottschalk was the poet who addressed Christ, and who was capable of acting as an intermediary between God and his companion. His was the leading position. The boy attended the author in his exile, but also reminded him of his duty to praise Christ despite his sorrow. In this new dynamic, Gottschalk was no longer the lone sinner seeking divine aid that was witnessed in his hymns from the 830s. Now he was a faithful but suffering servant in exile, who was comforted by a young companion and hopeful of Christ's help.

Gottschalk's self-representation as exile suggested that, as in the case of the Israelites, God would save him from his predicament in due time. In the meantime, Gottschalk wanted his readers to recognize that he remained loyal to God and the truth despite his difficult circumstances. The fact that there are five extant copies of the hymn suggests very strongly that this self-portrait was known outside of Hautvillers, and that this hymn might have served as a lyrical expression of dissent for those identifying with Gottschalk as a wrongly persecuted martyr. In late antiquity, hymns were used as polemical devices by opposing Christian groups involved in doctrinal controversies, and it is certainly possible that Gottschalk's *Ut quid iubes* and other hymns such as his *Christe rex regum* served in a similar role among his supporters.¹³⁶ Of course, a hymn could be orally transmitted among his correspondents, making the written copies appear to be the surviving evidence of a possibly much larger circle of individuals who knew and sang the hymn out of solidarity with Gottschalk and because they identified with his sense of exile. In this way, Gottschalk's themes of devotion, election, humility, loyalty, persecution, and exile formed a coherent whole—an alternate identity and sense of community—for his correspondents who felt under threat from their archbishop.

CONCLUSION

While Gottschalk lamented his exile in the realm of heretics, he must still have been content that his efforts to contest his persecution and to disseminate his doctrine were proving effective: the elect were responding to his message, while the reprobate were revealing themselves all too readily. Key to this process was Gottschalk's creative appropriation of ancient and biblical typologies, which enabled him to make claims about his orthodoxy and holiness in the face of persecution.

¹³⁶ Carlos Galvao-Sobrinho, "Embodied Theologies: Christian Identity and Violence in Alexandria in the Early Arian Controversy," in *Violence in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Practices*, ed. Hale Drake (Burlington, VT: 2006), pp. 321–31, here p. 327; id., *Doctrine and Power: Theological Controversy and Christian Leadership in the Later Roman Empire* (Berkeley, 2013), pp. 54–9; Christopher Haas, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict* (Baltimore, 1997), esp. 268–77; Ramsay MacMullen, "The Historical Role of the Masses in Late Antiquity," in *Changes in the Roman Empire: Essays in the Ordinary* (Princeton, 1990), 250–76; and Ramsay MacMullen, "Cultural and Political Changes in the 4th and 5th Centuries," *Historia* 52 (2003), 465–95. Special thanks to Jacob Latham for these references.

By exploring how Gottschalk continued to explain his doctrine in his own terms, encouraged imitators and attacked those who had condemned him, this chapter has argued that Gottschalk presented a sophisticated and original challenge to the church hierarchy's authority to rule on doctrine and to administer correction. His imprisonment by heretical and reprobate forces gave Gottschalk a forum for enacting his election and for claiming a higher, God-given authority. These subversive activities take us into some of the murkier areas of cloister life, showing us how underground friendship networks enabled this outlawed intellectual activity to thrive. The monks of Hautvillers and their outside contacts not only participated in Gottschalk's program, but they also gave it a conspiratorial vitality that involved a sense of resistance to their abbot and episcopal superiors, the discussion of forbidden questions of theology, new devotional practices such as the singing of his hymns, and the bonding experience imparted by shared covert action. The community created out of this process made Gottschalk a presence within the Archdiocese of Rheims despite his incarceration.

Hincmar's struggles to contain the unusual threat of Gottschalk and his heresy reveal how the archbishop found himself in unexpected territory. The irony of Gottschalk's conviction was that in stopping him from preaching his doctrine to the laity, it had opened up a new monastic and clerical audience reachable through his contacts at Hautvillers and throughout the archdiocese. Not only was Hincmar unable to end the discussion of grace, but his authority and legitimacy were called into question by Gottschalk's network of dissent. In this sense, Gottschalk presented Hincmar with a set of problems with which no other Carolingian bishop in his day had to contend. Gottschalk's theological vision of election, which he articulated and performed from his cell, offered his new monastic and clerical supporters terms for defining their dissatisfaction with Hincmar as a heavy-handed persecutor of those whom he perceived as opponents (such as the Ebbo clerics). As an oppressed figure, Gottschalk could now serve as a focal point for such discontent among Hincmar's low-ranking opponents, as he gave these individuals a new, sophisticated discourse to frame the basis of their community and a set of uniquely subversive endeavors to transform sentiments into action. This historical development, which has not been examined by scholars before, was only beginning to take shape in the first years of Gottschalk's incarceration and it would gain momentum in the subsequent decade.

Another key feature of this conflict was how authority was or was not accepted as legitimate in the Carolingian world. Both Gottschalk and Hincmar drew from a shared set of texts, ideas, traditions, and assumptions about how one constructed an argument in order to claim authority. Of course, Hincmar's position gave him an official authority that Gottschalk simply did not possess. In traditional terms, Gottschalk's condemnation should have made it impossible for him to continue his activities, and the monks and clerics in the archdiocese should have followed their archbishop's admonition and viewed Gottschalk as a prideful heretic deserving of correction. Yet Gottschalk's claims that Hincmar's actions and doctrine revealed the archbishop to be a deceiving and reprobate heretic helped undermine his authority among those receptive to such a message. Gottschalk seems to have

been unusual in the ninth century not only as a controversial preacher, but also as one who resisted correction despite severe punishment, a fact that seems to have contributed to the sympathetic reception he received in some circles in the archdiocese. With Gottschalk as their focal point, these other nameless dissenters could resist what they regarded as Hincmar's illegitimate official authority in a form of pious, covert rebellion unlike anything otherwise seen in the Frankish world.

6

A Master of Subterranean Dissent, 850s

With the revival of controversy in the 850s, Gottschalk took a leading role in the doctrinal disputes of that decade and encouraged dissent among the clerics and monks of the Archdiocese of Rheims against Hincmar's rule. Through pamphlets smuggled out to an underground readership, Gottschalk succeeded in intensifying the controversy by providing arguments for resisting Hincmar and his doctrines, and by casting the archbishop as a heretical usurper and Antichrist. Emboldened by his consistent refusal to accept episcopal correction, Gottschalk continued to claim his orthodoxy and the right to correct errors, while still maintaining—as one of the elect—that he could miraculously survive a fiery ordeal in order to prove his doctrines. Yet Gottschalk also further developed his self-image as a theologian-martyr in the intense atmosphere of controversy by prophesying the death of the tyrannical Hincmar, his own ascension to the episcopal throne, and then his eventual martyrdom after a seven-year reign as archbishop.

Gottschalk's success at intensifying debate and defiance against Hincmar was a rare occurrence of resistance to episcopal authority and reform in the Carolingian world previously unexplored by scholars. To the archbishop's dismay, Gottschalk found common cause with other dissenters in his see, so that the threat of this subterranean resistance troubled him throughout the decade. In order to understand Gottschalk's role in these events, this chapter outlines the two chief theological debates of the 850s—the first over the question of grace and predestination, and the second over the use of the term *trina deitas*—before examining Gottschalk's role in these debates as a prophetic leader of dissent. The investigation then turns to a detailed examination of Gottschalk's arguments for justifying resistance to earthly authorities, his instructions about how his correspondents should engage in theological debates against opponents no matter what their rank, and his attempts to convince Bishop Prudentius of Troyes—a fellow critic of Hincmar's doctrine—to accept his position on the predestination of the reprobate. This chapter demonstrates overall how Gottschalk's arguments against episcopal power provide a fascinating and alternative ninth-century view of hierarchical authority abused to such an extent that it became heretical oppression.

THE SYNODS OF 853 AND THE RENEWAL OF CONTROVERSY

In the spring of 853, there were synods at Quierzy and Soissons. At Quierzy, the assembled bishops accepted a doctrine developed by Hincmar as the orthodox

teaching of predestination, confirming thereby the decisions of the Synod of Quierzy of 849.¹ At the Synod of Soissons, the bishops condemned the use of the term *trina deitas* and declared as irregular and invalid the ordinations of the Ebbo clerics.² As noted previously, Hincmar had ordered the Ebbo clerics to stop carrying out their duties when he assumed his office in 845, and the question of their status had remained a problem ever since.³ Yet Hincmar's hopes that resistance to his authority by those sympathetic with Gottschalk or the Ebbo clerics would be dissolved in this way were severely misplaced. Now the archbishop appeared even more heavy-handed in his treatment of opponents and in his leadership of the synods, and the assemblies' rulings on doctrine were not accepted universally in the realm.

It was in this atmosphere of unrest that Gottschalk found a growing readership for his next set of writings, many of which took the form of small "leaflets" (*schedulae*) that were easy to produce and transport.⁴ That common ground was found between those interested in the doctrinal debates and the mishandling of the Ebbo clerics was attested by Hincmar himself,⁵ and Gottschalk's participation in these particular controversies is part of the larger story of political struggle in Hincmar's archdiocese. Before turning to Gottschalk's activities in particular, let us lay out the course of each controversy individually to make clear the series of events during this turbulent era.

The predestination controversy is the proper place to begin, for this doctrinal debate was the greatest of the period, involving theologians, bishops, and rulers in most of the Carolingian realms. At the Synod of Quierzy (853) under the auspices of Charles the Bald, Hincmar succeeded in having his Four Chapters passed.⁶ These chapters were recorded in the *Annales Bertiniani* as follows: there is only one predestination and no one is predestined to punishment; freewill was restored through grace; God wills generally that all be saved, though all are not; and Christ's blood was shed for all, but all are not saved.⁷ This doctrine was not accepted by Gottschalk and other opponents of Hincmar's earlier teachings, and these chapters were soon condemned even outside of Charles the Bald's kingdom at the Synod of Valence, held by Emperor Lothar in January, 855.⁸ In particular, the bishops there were concerned that Hincmar regarded the pseudo-Augustinian text, *Hypomnesticon*,

¹ *MGH Conc.* III, No. 28 [Quierzy, Spring 853], pp. 294–8.

² *MGH Conc.* III, No. 27 [Soissons, April 853], pp. 253–93; and Hincmar, *De una*, *PL* 125: 513. On the connection between *trina deitas* and the synod, see: Schrörs, *Hincmar*, p. 151; Cappuyns, *Jean*, p. 185; and Devisse, *Hincmar*, p. 156. On Ebbo's second tenure as archbishop, see Goetting, *Ebbo*, pp. 69–70.

³ *MGH Conc.* II, 2, No. 61 [Ingelheim, 840], *Narratio clericorum Remensium*, pp. 812–13.

⁴ Hincmar, *De una*, *PL* 125: 580.

⁵ Nelson, *Charles*, pp. 168–9; and Hincmar, *Liber*, 36, *PL* 125: 386.

⁶ Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 126–33; Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 199–205; and Ganz, "Predestination," p. 297.

⁷ *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 853, ed. Grat et al., p. 67.

⁸ *MGH Conc.* III, No. 33 [Valence, 855], pp. 347–65; Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 133–7; Peter McKeon, "The Carolingian Councils of Savonnières (859) and Tusey (860) and their Background," *Revue Bénédictine* 84 (1974), pp. 75–110, here pp. 94–7; Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 214–24; and Tavard, *Trina*, pp. 34–5.

as the church father's own.⁹ Hincmar found himself on the defensive again, and wrote his second work on predestination, which unfortunately is lost.¹⁰ According to the archbishop, his text was composed in three books and seems to have involved a lengthy attack on Gottschalk, Ratramnus, Prudentius (who by this time was openly critical of Hincmar's doctrines), and their supporters.¹¹ Hincmar was also particularly furious about the Valence bishops, for the synod had been organized by Bishop Ebbo of Grenoble, who was Ebbo of Rheims' nephew.¹² He viewed Ebbo's opposition to the Four Chapters as a political attack in retribution for his conflict with his Rheims predecessor and the deposition of the Ebbo clerics.

The issue of predestination remained contentious for a few years until the Synod of Savonnières in 859, where forty-two bishops gathered in the presence of Charles the Bald, Lothar II of Lotharingia, and Charles of Provence.¹³ The purpose of the council was to restore concord between the churches of the different realms on the issue of predestination in particular. At this council, Remigius of Lyons presented decrees from the Synod of Langres of the same year, decrees which attacked Eriugena's position, but did not explicitly condemn the Synod of Quierzy of 853.¹⁴ Charles the Bald, however, demurred so that Hincmar could offer a response, which came in the form of his third treatise on predestination, his massive *Liber de praedestinatione*.¹⁵ In this work, Hincmar attacked Gottschalk (whom as noted previously he claimed the Synod of Quierzy of 849 had rightfully condemned), the *capitula* of Valence, the writings of Florus of Lyons, and the position of Prudentius.¹⁶

The debate on predestination came to an end in 860. In that year, the bishops from the kingdoms of Charles the Bald, Lothar II, and Charles of Provence met at the Synod of Tusey, where they formed a consensus: there was predestination to salvation; both human free will and grace were necessary for salvation; no mention of predestination to damnation was made.¹⁷ Although the need for grace had been accepted, the most contentious issues (such as the predestination of the damned) were carefully left unmentioned. With this agreement, Gottschalk's condemnation was tacitly confirmed. This was the final synod that would address the issue of predestination, ending the controversy that had continued for seven years after the Synod of Quierzy in 853, and eleven since Gottschalk's conviction.

⁹ Ganz, "Predestination," p. 298.

¹⁰ Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 214–24.

¹¹ Hincmar, *Liber*, PL 125: 85–93; and Ganz, "Predestination," p. 298.

¹² Ganz, "Predestination," p. 298.

¹³ *MGH Conc.* III No. 47 [Savonnières, 859], pp. 447–89; Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 140–1; McKeon, "Councils," pp. 84–8 and 104–5; Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 222–4; and Ganz, "Predestination," pp. 298–9.

¹⁴ *MGH Conc.* III No. 47E [Savonnières, 859], pp. 473–6; McKeon, "Councils," pp. 87–8; and Ganz, "Predestination," p. 298.

¹⁵ Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 141–2; Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 223–4; and Ganz, "Predestination," p. 299.

¹⁶ Ganz, "Predestination," p. 299. For analysis of the treatise, see: Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 141–50; and especially Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 224–68.

¹⁷ *MGH Conc.* IV, No. 3 [Tusey, 860], pp. 12–42, here 22–34; McKeon, "Councils," pp. 76–84 and 105–9; Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 269–79; Ganz, "Predestination," pp. 300–1; and Chazelle, *Crucified*, pp. 169–70.

Unlike the issue of predestination, the controversy of triune deity did not attract interest from outside of Charles the Bald's kingdom. This debate was primarily a personal one between Hincmar and his opponents, Ratramnus, and especially Gottschalk. In 853 Hincmar led the Synod of Soissons to condemn the use of the term "triune deity" (*trina deitas*) as found in the anonymous hymn *Sanctorum meritis inclita gaudia*.¹⁸ According to his *De una et non trina deitate*, written 856–7, Hincmar claimed that he had researched the matter of *trina deitas* carefully in ancient codices and discovered that it was heretical, since it had not been used by the fathers.¹⁹ On his recommendation, the synod forbade the singing of *Sanctorum meritis* with the traditional language, changing the line to read "summa deitas" instead.²⁰ In his *De una*, Hincmar also examined some of Gottschalk's writings for the clerics of his diocese, annotating those passages with an *obelus* (÷) as a mark of disapproval, and taught his audience how to refute them.²¹

Modern scholarly interest in the triune deity debate has focused on the theological positions of Gottschalk and Hincmar. Late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century German scholars, including Freystedt, Kagerah, and Vielhaber, were primarily concerned with Gottschalk's thought on the issue,²² while Schrörs focused especially on Hincmar's theology.²³ Jean Jolivet wrote an in-depth study of Gottschalk's philosophical arguments on this matter,²⁴ while further work on Hincmar's theology was done by Leo Davis and Devisse, with the latter's examination of *De una* remaining key to understanding this text and establishing the debate's chronology.²⁵ Most recently, Tavard's study of the *trina deitas* controversy offers insights into the debate (including analysis of both Gottschalk's and Hincmar's arguments), although like previous scholars his concern is chiefly theological, including what the controversy can tell present-day theologians.²⁶

This traditional focus on theological arguments, however, has failed to reveal the intensely personal and political nature of the *trina deitas* debate. Hincmar's investigations into the orthodoxy of *trina deitas* probably began in 849 when he

¹⁸ Hincmar, *De una*, PL 125: 513; Schrörs, *Hincmar*, p. 151; Cappuyns, *Jean*, p. 185; and Devisse, *Hincmar*, p. 156. The hymn is *Sanctorum meritis inclita gaudia*, ed. Guido Maria Dreves, *Analecta Hymnica* 2 (1888), p. 75, which survives in the *Breviarium gothicum*, PL 86: 885–939, here 908–9.

¹⁹ On the composition date of the *De una*, see Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 156–7 and 163–4; Ganz, "Theology," p. 767; and Tavard, *Trina*, p. 37. According to Flodoard, it was written for Charles the Bald: Flodoard, *Historia*, III, 15, ed. Stratmann, pp. 241–2.

²⁰ Hincmar, *De una*, PL 125: 498; Schrörs, *Hincmar*, p. 152; and Devisse, *Hincmar*, p. 156. On the correction, see also Venance Grumel, "Te trina deitas," *Recherches de science religieuse* 17 (1927), pp. 324–6. The altered version of the hymn can be found in the office for martyrs of the *Breviarium gothicum*: PL 86: 999.

²¹ van Renswoude and Steinová, "The Annotated Gottschalk."

²² Freystedt, "Der Streit über die göttliche Trinität im 9. Jahrhundert," *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 41 (1898), pp. 392–401; Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, pp. 55–63, which contains many excerpts from the then still unpublished works in Bern 584; and Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 74–7.

²³ Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 150–74.

²⁴ Jolivet, *Godescalc*, pp. 33–111 and 161–84.

²⁵ Leo Davis, "Hincmar of Reims as Theologian of the Trinity," *Traditio* 27 (1971), pp. 455–68, who does not consider the conflict with Gottschalk in his analysis; and Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 154–86.

²⁶ Tavard, *Trina*, pp. 59–130 and regarding the controversy's current lessons for theologians, pp. 131–52.

received Gottschalk's *Confessio prolixior*, although previous scholars have suggested 850.²⁷ Gottschalk's *Confessio prolixior* included the language not only "trinus et unus dominator," but also "trina unitas et una trinitas."²⁸ Hincmar was also aware that the term "una et trina deitas" was being sung in the hymn *Sanctorum meritis* by some associated with Gottschalk, and he voiced his concerns to Hrabanus, who responded that he did not know where the term came from, but he was certain it was heretical.²⁹ Hincmar concurred with Hrabanus: like *praedestinatio gemina*, *trina deitas* must be heretical terminology if it was being used by Gottschalk and his supporters. After Hincmar conducted his investigation, he led the proceedings at the Synod of Soissons in 853, which condemned it.

Ratramnus and Gottschalk both wrote against the bishops' decision, claiming that *trina deitas* was orthodox. According to Hincmar, Ratramnus sent "a volume of no small size" on the matter to Bishop Hildegard of Meaux (who was ordained on Charles the Bald's command in 856), and the archbishop complained that it had been compiled "from the books of Saints Hilary and Augustine by mutilating their words and twisting them incongruously to [the author's] own depraved meaning."³⁰ Yet as far as Hincmar was concerned, Gottschalk—as a "pseudo-monk," whose doctrines could *only* be wrong—presented the real threat. The archbishop reported that his numerous texts soon included some writings against the synod's decision, and characterizing Gottschalk once again as a diabolical contagion he denounced his arguments as heresy, a deadly virus of idolatry, something stirred up by the devil, blasphemy, and incantations (*naeniae*).³¹

Yet Hincmar claimed that Gottschalk wrote against the decision to condemn triune deity as much out of jealousy (*invidia*) of his position as archbishop as out of his habit of creating novelties that were contrary to patristic teachings.³² Hincmar's rancor was certainly aroused by Gottschalk's continued efforts to resist his authority; but the archbishop became furious when he learned of a prophecy that his opponent made, in which Hincmar would be killed in an act of divine retribution, only to be replaced as archbishop by Gottschalk himself.³³ This fascinating and shocking turn of events reveals the especially personal nature of the triune deity debate, which had developed out of the discord and conflict already taking place in the archdiocese. No one outside of the see of Rheims became involved in the debate, and no other synods were held to decide this particular issue. Yet the fact that Hincmar revised his work, *De una et non trina deitate*, after Gottschalk's death in the late 860s suggests that issue remained alive in the archdiocese throughout that decade.³⁴

²⁷ Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 154–6 and 163–4; and Tavard, *Trina*, pp. 35–8.

²⁸ Gottschalk, *Confessio prolixior*, *CEG*, p. 76.

²⁹ Hrabanus, *Epistola* 43, *MGH Epp.* V, p. 488; and Tavard, *Trina Deitas*, p. 36.

³⁰ Hincmar, *De una*, *PL* 125: 475: "Ratramnus, Corbeiae monasterii monachus, ex libris beatorum Hilarii et Augustini, dicta eorumdem detruncando, et ad pravum suum sensum incongrue inflectendo . . ." On Hildegard, see: *MGH Conc.* III, 27. [Soissons, April 853], p. 278.

³¹ Hincmar, *De una*, *PL* 125: 479, 480–1, 484, 510, 579, and 613.

³² Hincmar, *De una*, *PL* 125: 475.

³³ Hincmar, *De una*, *PL* 125: 495.

³⁴ See the last section of Chapter 7.

The matter of the Ebbo clerics was the third controversial issue that Hincmar tried to resolve in the spring of 853. The deposed clerics sought to regain their offices throughout the decade and into the 860s, when Pope Nicholas became interested in their case.³⁵ Hincmar regarded the clerics as a threat to his legitimacy as archbishop, since questions remained as to the legality and validity of Ebbo's deposition, a problem that dogged Hincmar through much of his early tenure of office. In response to their treatment, the Ebbo clerics claimed that Hincmar had acted aggressively against them since he became bishop in 845. At the Synod of Soissons they were intimidated into accepting the ruling of judges, whom they suspected of not being impartial on the matter; as a result their offices were "violently" (*violenter*) taken away from them, since they feared any resistance would be characterized as "pride and arrogance" (*superbia et arrogantia*).³⁶ They stressed, however, that they had always acted "humbly" (*humiliter*) and "peacefully" (*pacifice*) toward the archbishop. Gottschalk's fate at the Synod of Quierzy (849) seems to have been especially relevant to them at Soissons, for they emphasized their fear of being seen as prideful if they resisted the bishops. They may have imagined that resistance would lead to imprisonment, as it had with Gottschalk, from which there appeared to be no release.

If Gottschalk's case was significant for how the Ebbo clerics handled themselves at the synod, it must also have been important for how the synod's ruling was viewed in the see. The clerics had been careful *not* to resist episcopal authority, and yet they were thought to have been treated unfairly anyway. After the synods of 853, Hincmar's opponents (including Gottschalk) had even more reason to find common cause than before, since they now could claim that the archbishop had dealt with them in an aggressive and partisan manner because of their connection with his predecessor, Ebbo. This situation led Hincmar repeatedly to stress the circumstances of Gottschalk's condemnation, which had been passed canonically and not by his own individual ruling, in order to defend himself against charges of partiality. The events of 853 must have also placed Gottschalk's treatment at the Synod of Quierzy in 849 in a somewhat different perspective. Gottschalk's "contumacy" in the face of episcopal authority might now appear as understandable resistance to a tyrannical archbishop. Now after the synods of 853, Gottschalk became a leading voice of defiance against this tyranny, joining doctrinal arguments with resistance against Hincmar in his writings for a receptive readership.

GOTTSCHALK AS PROPHETIC LEADER OF RESISTANCE AGAINST HINCMAR

Gottschalk's calls for defiance against Hincmar culminated in his prophecy about the archbishop's death, his own assumption of the office, and then his martyrdom after ruling the see for seven years. According to Hincmar, this prediction was

³⁵ Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 237–92; and Devise, *Hincmar*, pp. 582–635.

³⁶ *MGH Conc.* II, 2, No. 61 [Ingelheim, 840], *Narratio clericorum Remensium*, pp. 812–13.

further evidence of Gottschalk's insanity and wickedness. Yet the prophecy needs to be viewed within the context of the controversies following the synods of 853, if it is to be understood as a part of that conflict rather than simply dismissed as madness, as Hincmar recommended. Examined in this way, it becomes clear that Gottschalk's prophecy—like his ascetic renunciation of bathing in imitation of Saint Anthony—was one of several strategies for joining election to resistance in the public dispute with the archbishop.

Before moving on to Gottschalk's texts, a word is required about his readers in this era. Hincmar repeatedly claimed that Gottschalk had a large group of supporters. In 856–7 in his *De una*, Hincmar wrote that Gottschalk had numerous “accomplices and followers” (*complices ac satellites*), and also that Gottschalk was especially influential with young monks,³⁷ about whose corruption commentators on the Rule such as Hildemar expressed much anxiety.³⁸ When writing his *Liber de praedestinatione* at the end of the decade, he described Gottschalk and his followers as a dissolute and erroneous “school” (*schola*) of “rustics” (*rustici*), whom he dubbed the “New Predestinarians,” comparing them to the “Old Predestinarians” of the early church, a fabricated heresy that (as Chazelle has noted) Hincmar invented to discredit them.³⁹ Later in 864, Hincmar wrote that Gottschalk wanted to appear as a “teacher of his own teachers” (*suorum doctorum doctor*), and his followers included know-it-alls (*scioli*) and careless individuals with great zeal for God, but little knowledge.⁴⁰

Hincmar's descriptions of Gottschalk's supporters of the 850s suggest that they were typically young monks or clerics with considerable learning and piety, but without rank or status in the church hierarchy. Hincmar's stress on their “rusticity” in 859 emphasizes this point: they were mostly monks who did not move in the important circles of the archdiocese, and therefore their opinions about predestination revealed them to be studious, but misguided, “bumpkins” who did not know their place and whose Christianity was dubious.⁴¹ In this sense, they were very much like Gottschalk in Hincmar's eyes. While such a scattered group of monks and clerics offered no direct challenge to his power, their subterranean presence reflected the strong dissatisfaction with, and resentment toward, the archbishop that many felt in the archdiocese—a point that clearly troubled Hincmar, who knew he had enemies in his see.

The evidence from Gottschalk's texts offers important insights into what sort of people these followers were. The majority of Gottschalk's writings reveal that they were written to anonymous correspondents, who were addressed variously as “reader” (*lector*), “son” (*filius*) or “brother” (*frater*).⁴² This suggests that Gottschalk

³⁷ Hincmar, *De una*, PL 125: 475 and 613–14.

³⁸ Coon, *Dark Age Bodies*, pp. 119–20 and 124–6.

³⁹ Hincmar, *Liber*, PL 125: 106, 125, 130, 162, 165, 271, and 289; and Chazelle, *Crucified God*, p. 166.

⁴⁰ Hincmar, *Epistola* 169, *MGH Epp.* VIII, pp. 162–3.

⁴¹ On the tradition of “rusticitas” as an insult, see Peter Brown, *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (Chicago, 1981), pp. 119–27; and Raymond Van Dam, *Gregory of Tours: Glory of the Confessors* (Liverpool, 1988), pp. 12–13.

⁴² See, for example, Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, CEG, pp. 191, 192, 193, 194, 208, and 211; id., *De trina deitate*, CEG, pp. 83, 84, 90, 91, 92, and 96; id., *De Trinitate*, CEG, pp. 264, 267, 269, and 279; and id., *Quibus*, CEG, pp. 281–2.

intended his texts to be passed around from one reader to another, and that his readership really included curious individuals or small groups in a scattered textual community of monks and clerics.⁴³ Gottschalk, therefore, often did not direct his texts at specific individuals, and may not even have known the identity of many of the people who saw his writings. For these readers, Gottschalk provided learned arguments that were both amply supported by textual authorities and that contradicted the teachings of Hincmar and the doctrinal positions accepted by the synods of 853. They also provided striking examples of resistance to episcopal authority and Hincmar's especially.

Gottschalk's *Responsa de diversis*, however, seems to provide the one instance of an exchange with a specific supporter. This text includes a list of questions posed by a "young brother" (*adolescens frater*), which is followed by Gottschalk's answers.⁴⁴ The anonymous correspondent claimed that he "most firmly" and "truly" believed in the doctrine of triune deity, dating the text after the Synod of Soissons in the spring of 853.⁴⁵ The young questioner certainly fits the profile of one of Gottschalk's followers created by Hincmar: he was clearly learned and zealous in his faith, and he was deeply interested in discussing controversial doctrinal matters. In the epilogue at the end of the questions, the young monk stressed that he hoped Gottschalk would hold him "more faithful" (*fideliior*) for asking his questions and he praised his correspondent's impressive knowledge and talents.⁴⁶ In return, Gottschalk acknowledged the young monk's fidelity in a prayer, in which he asked Christ to make him one of the elect through grace for his loyalty to Gottschalk and for his belief in twin predestination.⁴⁷ In this case, Gottschalk addressed his reader very much in the monastic tradition of the *magister* and *discipulus* relationship.⁴⁸

The anonymous questioner should be seen as typical of Gottschalk's imagined readers. Gottschalk and "the young monk" framed their interaction in terms of mutual respect (although Gottschalk was clearly in the superior position), a shared belief in the same doctrines, and an emphasis on piety. Yet their exchange does not display the kind of intimate relationship found in Gottschalk's previous letters to friends and bishops; instead this young monk, who read Gottschalk's texts and even took the risk of writing to him, had only limited contact with him. The circumstances of Gottschalk's confinement did not permit any other kind of relationship, except for monks at Hautvillers specifically.

Gottschalk produced a number of writings in response to the synods of 853 calling on his readers to resist Hincmar and the doctrinal rulings of the synods, including: various *schedulae*, which were preserved in Hincmar's *De una*;⁴⁹ his

⁴³ Stock, *The Implications of Literacy*, pp. 88–101 and 145–50.

⁴⁴ Gottschalk, *Responsa de diversis*, *CEG*, pp. 149–50.

⁴⁵ Gottschalk, *Responsa de diversis*, *CEG*, p. 136: "De trina deitate et una, quae est sicut firmissime teneo et veraciter credo trina in personis una in deitate substantiae vel in unitate naturae."

⁴⁶ Gottschalk, *Responsa de diversis*, *CEG*, p. 132.

⁴⁷ Gottschalk, *Responsa de diversis*, *CEG*, pp. 149–50.

⁴⁸ de Jong, "Growing Up," pp. 114–19; and ead., "From *scholastici* to *scioli*," pp. 45–57.

⁴⁹ Gottschalk, *Schedula et fragmenta* I–XI, *CEG*, pp. 19–36; and Hincmar, *De una*, PL 125: 473–6, 495, 512, 515, 526, 527, 529, 578, 580, 581, 583, 588–90, 593, 597, 604–5, and 613.

De trina deitate, which appears in Bern 584 and seems to be a collection of short texts (like the *schedula*) addressed to various readers;⁵⁰ and a second Bern 584 text, his *De praedestinatione*.⁵¹ This section examines Gottschalk's *schedulae* following the synods of 853, while his *De trina deitate* and *De praedestinatione* and their calls for resistance are examined separately in the following sections.⁵²

Gottschalk's *schedulae* reveal a changing style of argumentation in his conflict with Hincmar between 853 and 856–7. These leaflets reveal the intensity of Gottschalk's efforts to respond to the synods' decisions, and to portray himself as an authoritative figure in the debates immediately after the spring of 853. The first *schedula* examined here includes Gottschalk's doctrinal arguments and his claims that he was a special witness to the truth of triune deity, and it is the only complete leaflet preserved in Hincmar's text. The two other fragments of *schedulae* examined here reveal the growing severity of the debate as Gottschalk and Hincmar became increasingly personal and sharp in their attacks on one another.

As in his writings following his condemnations, Gottschalk combined doctrinal arguments with claims about his special role in revealing God's truth in the full-length *schedula* preserved by Hincmar. Gottschalk's central concern was that the elect should be helped by God's grace to believe and confess the truth of *trina deitas* just as they confessed *praedestinatio gemina*, showing a link between both doctrines, orthodoxy, resistance to heresy, and election.⁵³ He claimed that the term had been used throughout church history, and prayed that those readers, who were among the elect, would be granted the necessary grace to continue the tradition of the "great, holy and universal church" (*ecclesia magna sancta catholica*).⁵⁴ In this way, Gottschalk wanted his readers to accept triune deity, like twin predestination, as a catchphrase of orthodoxy.

Gottschalk equated *trina et una deitas* with *trinus et unus deus*—a patristic description of God embraced at the Synod of Friuli in 796/797 during the Adoptionist Controversy to emphasize the equality of the members of the Trinity.⁵⁵ In doing so Gottschalk sought to maintain linguistically the indivisibility, omnipotence, and immortality of God, which he claimed had been supported by the church fathers and in hymns:

Whoever there is, who says that "triune deity" cannot be catholically said, but only "one deity," ought to be interrogated precisely how he says "one" or in what way—that is whether essentially or personally . . . And since just as it cannot be changed in the

⁵⁰ Gottschalk, *De trina deitate*, *CEG*, pp. 81–130.

⁵¹ Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, *CEG*, pp. 180–258.

⁵² On the two Bern 584 texts, see Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, pp. 55–63 and 69–74; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 68–77; Jolivet, *Godescalc*, pp. 88–102; Tavard, *Trina*, pp. 40–2 and 65–70; and Chazelle, *Crucified*, pp. 173–8. Otto Stegmüller, "Martin von Tours oder Gottschalk von Orbais?" *Revue Bénédictine* 76 (1966), pp. 177–230 suggested that Gottschalk may have been the author of the *Liber sancti Martini de Trinitate*, although this is unlikely since the earliest manuscript of the text dates to Tours before 834.

⁵³ Gottschalk, *Schedula*, *CEG*, p. 24.

⁵⁴ Gottschalk, *Schedula*, *CEG*, pp. 25–6.

⁵⁵ *MGH Conc. II*, No. 21 [Friuli, 796/797], pp. 177–95, here 187; and Pelikan, *The Emergence*, pp. 211–25. See also: Schrörs, *Hincmar*, p. 153; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, p. 74; and Jolivet, *Godescalc*, pp. 35–52.

hymns and books of the holy fathers where it says “triune and one God” to say “holy and one God,” so certainly it cannot be changed without the ruin of death where it says “triune and one deity” so that it should say there “holy and one deity.” Because, in fact, since this could not at all be done where “and one” is not added but only “triune deity” is said, so much less can it happen where “triune and one deity” is said, for clearly it would soon be said to the simple as follows: Behold it is now clear that triune deity neither could nor, in fact, can be said—but only one deity.⁵⁶

According to Gottschalk, it was spiritual death to change the wording of the hymns and patristic books, and he went on to explain that the Trinity was “essentially” (*naturaliter*) one and “personally” (*personaliter*) triune—what Vielhaber called his “simple, precise formula.”⁵⁷ Accordingly, the change from *trina* to *summa* adopted by the Synod of Soissons, or *sancta* as Gottschalk wrote, was heretical and would confuse simple believers, imperiling their souls.

In particular, Gottschalk saw that the real danger of altering the terminology was the revival of old heresies. He argued that such a change placed one either in the camp of the Arians, who believed like the pagans that there were three (*tres*) gods and deities, or that of the Sabellians and Patripassians, who believed in only one God and deity like the Jews.⁵⁸ For support, Gottschalk drew on evidence from the Greek church, from what he referred to as a “*liber de sancto synodo*,” which contained acts of the Sixth Ecumenical Council held in Constantinople (680–1).⁵⁹ At this council, Constantine IV and his bishops condemned Monothelitism, claiming that Christ had two wills as well as two natures.⁶⁰ Gottschalk wrote that the council condemned the Arian position of “worshipping three deities,” while approving the worship of the “triune deity.”⁶¹

As Tavard points out, the text was found in the emperor’s edict about the synod rather than the proceedings themselves, and contained the phrase “*conglorificanda trina deitas*.”⁶² Gottschalk asserted that *trina deitas* was the orthodox, Latin

⁵⁶ Gottschalk, *Schedula*, CEG, pp. 20–1: “Quisquis est ille qui dicit quod nequaquam deitas trina dici catholice possit sed solummodo deitas una sit, debet interrogari subtiliter quomodo dicat unam vel qualiter, utrum scilicet naturaliter an personaliter . . . Ac per hoc sicut non potest in hymnis et in sanctorum patrum libris ubi dicitur: Trinus et unus deus immutari et dici: Sanctus et unus deus, ita nimirum sine mortis exitio immutari non potest ubi dicitur: Trina et una deitas ut ibi dicatur: Sancta et una deitas, quia revera cum hoc nec ibi possit ullatenus fieri ubi non est addita: et una sed solummodo dicitur deitas trina, multo minus ibi potest fieri ubi deitas trina dicitur et una, quia scilicet simplicibus mox diceretur sicut et dicitur: Ecce nunc iam patet quia non poterat nec potest revera dici deitas trina sed tantum deitas una.”

⁵⁷ Gottschalk, *Schedula*, CEG, pp. 20–1; and Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, p. 77: “einfache, präzise Formel.” See also Freystedt, “Der Streit,” p. 395; Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, p. 55; and Jolivet, *Godescalc*, pp. 35–40.

⁵⁸ Gottschalk, *Schedula*, CEG, pp. 21–2. See also Schrörs, *Hincmar*, p. 154; Freystedt, “Der Streit,” pp. 394–5; Kagerah, *Gottschalk*, p. 55; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, p. 76; and Devisse, *Hincmar*, p. 160.

⁵⁹ Gottschalk, *Schedula*, CEG, pp. 21–2.

⁶⁰ On the council, see: “Concilium oecumenicale VI,” in *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. Jiovan Domenico Mansi, 31 vols. (Florence, 1758–98), III, 470 and 503; and on both councils, see: Leo Davis, *The First Seven Ecumenical Councils (325–787): Their History and Theology* (Collegeville, MN: 1990), pp. 33–80 and 258–89. Ian Wood, *The Merovingian Kingdoms 450–751* (New York, 1994), pp. 245–6 discusses the Frankish response to Monothelitism.

⁶¹ Gottschalk, *Schedula*, CEG, pp. 21–2: “arriani colentes tritheoteias id est tres deitates.”

⁶² Tavard, *Trina*, pp. 106–7; and Devisse, *Hincmar*, p. 170, note 308.

translation of the term “trideity” (*tritheoteia*) found in the Greek record of the council.⁶³ Hincmar claimed in his *De una* that Gottschalk or one of his accomplices had falsified the manuscript of the conciliar proceedings, which Hincmar asked to be copied at Hautvillers.⁶⁴ There is no way to know whether such a falsification ever took place, although Devisse thought it likely based on the frequency of such activity in ninth-century scriptoria.⁶⁵ Were Gottschalk somehow associated with the translation of this text, he could have recommended the rendering, which accorded with his conceptualization of the Trinity.

Fundamental to understanding this *schedula*, however, is that Gottschalk did not refer to Augustine or any other of his usual patristic authorities when presenting his case.⁶⁶ He instead relied heavily on Latin poets and the hymn, *Sanctorum meritis*. He noted that poets had used terms that were similar to *trina deitas*: (Pseudo-) Prosper described God as “triune majesty” (*trina maiestas*), Prudentius used the term “triune mercy” (*trina pietas*), and Arator wrote “triune power” (*trina potestas*).⁶⁷ Gottschalk wanted his reader to recognize that these various “triune” descriptions of God captured the orthodox meaning of the Trinity, and that the word “triune” could correspondingly be applied to the term deity. Yet for an actual use of the term, he turned to the last verse of *Sanctorum meritis*:⁶⁸

We beseech you, triune and one deity,
To absolve our sins, remove our crimes,
Give peace to your servants, and we will give
Glory to you for eternity.⁶⁹

Trinitarian language had become common in the ninth-century monastic liturgy, and other hymns existed containing the word “trinus,” with phrases such as “triune name” (*trinum nomen*) and “triune virtue” (*trina virtus*).⁷⁰ Gottschalk’s defense of the phrase *trina deitas* was a defense of this particular hymn as it was traditionally sung, while the synod condemned the term as a heretical novelty to be avoided.

⁶³ Gottschalk, *Schedula*, *CEG*, pp. 23 and 24; and Tavard, *Trina*, pp. 62–3.

⁶⁴ Hincmar, *De una*, *PL* 125: 441 and 512.

⁶⁵ Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 170–5. See also Tavard, *Trina*, p. 108; and van Renswoude and Steinová, “The Annotated Gottschalk.”

⁶⁶ Gottschalk later did this in other writings; see, for example: Gottschalk, *De trina deitate*, *CEG*, pp. 87, 89, 90–3, 97, 99, and 113–16.

⁶⁷ Gottschalk, *Schedula*, *CEG*, p. 22; Pseudo-Prosper, *De promissionibus et praedictionibus Dei*, *V*, 14, 18, *PL* 51: 733–858, here 858; Prudentius, *Liber Cathemerinon*, 3, line 20, ed. J. Bergmann, *CSEL* 61 (Vienna, 1926), p. 14; and Arator, *Historia apostolica.*, I, line 205 and II, line 587, ed. A.P. Orbán, *CCSL* 130 (Turnhout, 2006), pp. 238 and 349. See also: Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 160–2.

⁶⁸ Gottschalk, *Schedula*, *CEG*, p. 23.

⁶⁹ *Sanctorum meritis inclita gaudia*, ed. Dreves, p. 75: “Te, trina deitas unaque, poscimus,/ Ut culpas abluas, noxia subtrahas,/ Des pacem famulis, nos quoque gloriam/ Per cuncta tibi saecula.”

⁷⁰ Clemens Blume, *Der Cursus Sancti Benedicti Nursini und die liturgischen Hymnen des VI–IX Jahrhunderts in ihrer Beziehung zu den Sonntags- und -Ferialhymnen unseres Breviars* (Leipzig, 1908), pp. 118, 121, and 122; Devisse, *Hincmar*, p. 156, note 202; and Gunilla Iversen, “Pax et Sapientia: A Thematic Study on Tropes from Different Traditions (Based Primarily on Sanctus and Agnus Dei Tropes),” in *Pax et Sapientia: Studies in Text and Music of Liturgical Tropes and Sequences in Memory of Gordon Anderson*, ed. Ritva Jacobsson (Stockholm, 1986), pp. 23–58, here pp. 31–5.

Gottschalk expressed his key role in defending this traditional singing of the hymn in a three-line prayer in his *schedula* after quoting *Sanctorum meritis*: “Keep watch, O deity, who are called, believed,/ Declared, recognized and shown to be triune and one,/ As we acted in all things to help your servants.”⁷¹ Gottschalk overall wanted his readers to see him as one whose belief and confession of triune deity should serve as an example, linking orthodoxy and election with his resistance to the decision of the Synod of Soissons and Hincmar’s authority.

Gottschalk stressed his individual role in revealing the truth of triune deity to an even greater degree in a fragment of a *schedula* where he reimagined his fiery ordeal in the context of the triune deity controversy. On this occasion, Gottschalk claimed that he would survive a deadly *examen* to prove the orthodoxy of both triune deity and twin predestination. He altered the trial from its description in the *Confessio prolixior* so that there would be only three barrels of boiling liquids (not four) in association with his triune deity theology. For his part, Hincmar offered severe criticism of Gottschalk’s ordeal, which he argued was proof that his claims were fraudulent:

In his writings, Gottschalk—disturbed by a raving spirit and clearly another Simon Magus in proportion to his small measure—often promised mendaciously with elevated heart and proud eyes that he would walk “above himself” in miracles, seeking that three barrels be prepared for him—one barrel filled with boiling lard, a second filled with boiling oil, and a third filled with boiling pitch—and after entering in turn each barrel all the way to the neck and exiting from them unharmed, his assertion would be believed by all to be most true. For beyond his blasphemy that the deity is personally triune as it is essentially one, he says that just as God predestined the elect to the eternal kingdom so did he the reprobate to eternal annihilation, and that he does not wish all men to be saved except only those who are saved, and that he did not suffer except only for the elect, and none of them will perish for whom the blood of Christ was spilt. No faithful and sober person should accept this idea . . .⁷²

Hincmar characterized his opponent as a lesser Simon Magus based on his claims about the miracles he would perform. Simon Magus—appearing first in the Acts of the Apostles (8, 9–24), where he sought to buy the power of the Holy Spirit from the Apostle Peter, and then in the apocryphal Christian texts, *Actus Petri cum*

⁷¹ Gottschalk, *Schedula*, *CEG*, p. 23: “O deitas vigila quae trina vocaris et una/ Crederis assereris cognosceris atque probaris,/ Auxiliare tuis ut egemus ad omnia servis.”

⁷² Hincmar, *De una*, *PL* 125: 495: “Quapropter his quae Gothescalcus, alter videlicet pro modulo suo Simon magus, in scriptis suis frequenter posuit spiritu furioso exagitatus exaltato corde et elatis oculis se mendaciter promittens in mirabilibus super se ambulaturum petendo ut se sibi tria dolia parentur, unum videlicet dolium plenum ferventi adipe et aliud plenum ferventi oleo et tertium plenum bullienti pice, et cum vicissim in unumquodque dolium usque ad collum intrans de illis tribus doliis illaesum exierit credatur ab omnibus assertio illius esse verissima, qua dicit praeter istam blasphemiam quod deitas sic personaliter sit trina ut est naturaliter una, quia sicut deus electos ad regnum aeternum ita reprobos ad interitum praedestinavit aeternum, et non vult omnes homines salvos fieri nisi tantum eos qui salvantur, et non est passus nisi tantummodo pro electis, et nullus de iis periet pro quibus fusus est sanguis Christi, nemo fidelis ac sobrius sensum debet accommodare . . .” Lambot, *CEG*, p. 26, thought that this passage referred to the *Confessio prolixior*, although the fact that he changed the number of barrels suggests that it was a reconfiguration of the ordeal.

Simone, the *Passio sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli*, and the Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitiones* and homilies—came to be the quintessential figure associated with pseudo-apostleship, sexual perversion, heresy, and magic in the patristic and early medieval periods.⁷³ In particular, it was generally claimed that Simon used magic, sometimes in the form of pseudo-miracles, for his own selfish ends, which was clearly the same criticism meant by Hincmar.⁷⁴

The severity of Hincmar's criticisms of Gottschalk's character indicates that Hincmar saw him in even more dangerous terms than earlier. According to the archbishop, Gottschalk's claims about miracles were not the product of humility and God's grace, but the tricks of a wicked, selfish magician wanting to dupe others through displays of pseudo-holiness. Gottschalk's response to Hincmar's criticism was equally severe. It came in the form of his prophecy, which was preserved as a fragment from one of his *schedulae* in the archbishop's *De una*. Gottschalk denounced Hincmar as a usurper like the Antichrist, and portrayed himself not only as a saintly member of the elect, wrongfully persecuted by heretics, but also as God's choice for archbishop of Rheims and the crown of martyrdom. Gottschalk placed himself, therefore, in the position of being Hincmar's just rival for the episcopal throne, and he styled himself as his holy alternate—one whose claims of future miracles, divine revelations, and martyrdom were meant to prove that he was God's true and faithful servant.

As noted before, Gottschalk's prophecy should be understood in the context of the unrest following the synods of the spring of 853 and as a response to Hincmar's criticism. For the archbishop had begun to deride all of Gottschalk's claims to receive divine revelations as "the nonsense of a madman and old wives' tales" (*deliramenta maniaci et aniles fabulae*), only recounting such "incantations" (*neniae*) to prove that he was as wicked as he was mad.⁷⁵ In doing so, Hincmar was attacking Gottschalk's claims about himself from early 849, which had helped Gottschalk to further the debate on predestination and to discredit Hincmar's legitimacy as a theologian and archbishop before a growing audience. It was therefore critical that Hincmar attack him on this point. Yet if Hincmar's characterization of Gottschalk as Simon Magus was meant to portray him as a phoney holy man, then Gottschalk chose to respond with the most poignant image of a wicked and tyrannical enemy of God: Antichrist.

Hincmar reported Gottschalk's prophecy in his *De una* and included a letter expressing Gottschalk's reaction when it did not come to pass:

Indeed some years ago it was revealed to him, he wrote to certain familiars, that I—usurping power just as the Antichrist—would die immediately after three and a half

⁷³ *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* and *Passio sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli*, ed. Richard Adelbert Lipsius and Max Bonnet (New York, 1972), pp. 45–103 and 119–77; and *Die Pseudoklementinen*, ed. Bernhard Rehm (Berlin, 1965). See also: Valerie Flint, *The Rise of Magic in the Early Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1991), pp. 338–44; Alberto Ferreiro, "Sexual Depravity, Doctrinal Error, and Character Assassination in the Fourth Century: Jerome against the Priscillianists," *Studia Patristica* 28 (1993), pp. 28–38; and id., "Simon Magus: The Patristic-Medieval Traditions and Historiography," *Apocrypha* 7 (1996), pp. 147–65.

⁷⁴ Flint, *Magic*, p. 342.

⁷⁵ Hincmar, *De una*, PL 125: 613.

years of his revelation, that he would become bishop of Rheims, and that after seven years he would be killed by poison and thus come to the glory of the martyrs. And when he saw that the prophecy (created by his own mind) was not fulfilled, he wrote this among other things to a certain young follower of his sect, the sort he was accustomed to esteem highly: "But now is the time that a distant brother is forsaken—not knowing at all what I would say to him before he should see my writings—and I poured out prayers to God, present always and everywhere, the eternally-knowing, free giver of all things. Lord, our God and master Jesus Christ, crucified for the elect alone, you who see that 'behold your enemies resound and those who hate you raise up their head' [Ps 82, 3], since the thief and brigand has not died in three and one half years as was thought. Briefly, but indeed lying before you, I entreat you in this matter, our true and living Lord God, one and triune, that you should do it quickly, just as it pleases you. I do not want it earlier or otherwise: when you wish may that adulterer and blind, shameless, obstinate, stubborn heretic, enemy of truth and friend of falsehood be plucked out rightly enough."⁷⁶

As in the case of his *examen*, Hincmar used this text as evidence of Gottschalk's wickedness and falsehood. Immediately following this passage, Hincmar contrasted him to Augustine (with whom Gottschalk had compared himself before) arguing that the church father had taught that one should pray for enemies rather than for their death.⁷⁷ He also maintained how the fact that Gottschalk's prophecy had proved false was evidence that *he* was really the enemy of Christ as well as a fraud.⁷⁸ As the case of Thiota the prophetess at the Synod of Mainz (847) illustrated, prophecy was always connected with political power in the Carolingian world. Paul Dutton has demonstrated how the most prolific prophet of the ninth century, Audradus Modicus, went to great lengths to avoid upsetting his political superiors by emphasizing his humility and his hesitation to reveal his visions.⁷⁹ Yet in the heated atmosphere after the synods of 853, Gottschalk embraced prophecy as a weapon to use against his enemy at a time when his texts were being passed around more frequently than ever before.

The passage about Gottschalk's prophecy reveals a great deal about how he and his readers saw him and Hincmar in the heat of controversy following the synods of 853. The receiver of the letter was "forsaken" because the prophecy had not come

⁷⁶ Hincmar, *De una*, PL 125: 613: "Ante hos siquidem annos revelatum sibi quibusdam familiaribus suis scripsit quod ego statim post tres semis annos suae revelationis sicut Antichristus usurpans sibi potestatis potentiam mori, et ipse Remorum episcopus fieri et post septennium veneno interfici et sic gloriae martyrum adaequari deberet. Et cum prophetiam a spiritu suo inspiratam impleri non vidit, inter alia haec cuidam sectatori suo iuenculo, quales solebat diligere, scripsit: 'Sed iam tempus est fratrem deseri absentem et quid ad eum loquar antequam scripta mea videat penitus nescientem, et fundi preces ad deum semper ubique praesentem et sicut gratuitum donatorem cuncta sempiternaliter scientem. Domine deus noster et magister Iesu Christe, pro solis electis crucifixe, qui vides quod ecce inimici tui sonuerunt et qui oderunt te extulerunt caput [PS 82, 3] quia non est triennium dimidio terminato anno mortuus ceu putabatur fur et latro, breviter quidem sed pronus te exoro hinc vobis domino deo nostro vero ac vivo uni simul ac trino sicut placet ita facias cito. Nolo plus nec prius nec secus: quando vis evellatur hinc rite sat moechus et caecus procax pertinax pervicax haereticus veritatis inimicus falsitatis amicus.'" See also: Tavad, *Trina*, pp. 124–6.

⁷⁷ Hincmar, *De una*, PL 125: 614.

⁷⁸ Hincmar, *De una*, PL 125: 615.

⁷⁹ Dutton, *Politics*, pp. 128–56.

true, but Gottschalk would, in God's good time, restore goodness and order to the see, which Hincmar had ruined with his abuse of power. Gottschalk sought to discredit the archbishop as a usurper and brigand with images drawn from the Book of Revelation and the Psalms, while continuing to characterize himself as God's faithful, but persecuted, servant. His prophecy that he would become archbishop himself seems to have been part of what he saw as God's plan for the Archdiocese of Rheims: he would make things "right" with divine help before ascending to the great height of martyrdom.

According to Gottschalk's prophecy, the see of Rheims was currently dominated by reprobate members of the "body" of Antichrist—in particular Hincmar. He likened the archbishop himself to the great apocalyptic usurper of authority, the Antichrist, who would deny Christ and lead Christians away from the truth.⁸⁰ This was perhaps a fitting choice for Gottschalk, since Antichrist was the archetypal example of a figure predestined to death,⁸¹ and as an image joining Hincmar's heresy with his tyranny it must have been especially appealing to partisans of the Ebbo clerics. In his predestination writings, Gottschalk frequently connected the *reprobi* with the Antichrist, saying that the heretical teachings of Faustus of Lérins (Riez) were "a lethal poison of the Antichrist" (*lethiferum virus Antichristi*);⁸² that the damned were the "young goats of the Antichrist" (*haedi sunt Antichristi*) rather than Christ's sheep;⁸³ that the damned were the "members of the Antichrist" (*membra Antichristi*) instead of members of Christ;⁸⁴ and that they belonged to the "body of the Antichrist" (*corpus Antichristi*) instead of the body of Christ.⁸⁵

Gottschalk made his comparison between Hincmar and Antichrist at a historical moment when scholarly interest in this apocalyptic figure was growing considerably. For generations, Antichrist had been a subject of interest in Carolingian learned circles.⁸⁶ Alcuin and Hrabanus had written about it, and the image of the Antichrist had been used against political enemies during Louis the Pious' reign.⁸⁷ Yet greater interest in Antichrist is attested among theologians from Gottschalk's generation, as scholarship on Pauline texts developed substantially. Florus, Sedulius Scottus, and Haimo of Auxerre each engaged with patristic authorities on the

⁸⁰ Biblical references to Antichrist include: I Jo 2, 18 and 22; and 4, 3; and II Jo 1, 7. On views of Antichrist in the early medieval period, see: Bernard McGinn, *The Antichrist: Two Thousand Years of the Human Fascination with Evil* (New York, 2000), pp. 79–113; Kevin Hughes, *Constructing Antichrist: Paul, Biblical Commentary, and the Development of Doctrine in the Early Middle Ages* (Washington DC: 2005), pp. 115–67; and Palmer, *The Apocalypse*.

⁸¹ Adolph Harnack, *The History of Dogma*, trans. James Millar, 3rd rev. ed. (London, 1898), II, p. 302.

⁸² Gottschalk, *Confessio prolixior*, *CEG*, p. 66. On Faustus of Riez, see Gustave Weigel, *Faustus of Riez: an Historical Introduction* (Philadelphia, 1938); and Thomas Smith, *De Gratia: Faustus of Riez's Treatise on Grace and its Place in the History of Theology* (Notre Dame, 1990).

⁸³ Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, *CEG*, p. 345.

⁸⁴ Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, *CEG*, p. 226. See also: id., *Responsa de diversis*, *CEG*, p. 178.

⁸⁵ Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, *CEG*, pp. 189 and 203.

⁸⁶ Hughes, *Constructing*, pp. 115–67. See also Palmer, *The Apocalypse*, pp. 130–58 for a discussion of apocalyptic thought during Charlemagne's reign.

⁸⁷ Hughes, *Constructing*, pp. 121–38; and de Jong, *Penitential*, p. 197.

subject in their commentaries on Paul's Epistles.⁸⁸ Gottschalk's criticism of Hincmar as Antichrist, therefore, was leveled in a climate of increasing interest in this apocalyptic figure at a time when alarm about Hincmar's apparent abuse of power was at its height.

Gottschalk also used an allusion to Psalm 82, 3 to stress the need for ending Hincmar's rule in his prayer. He charged Hincmar with being a thief and brigand, an accusation that deserves further investigation in connection to his allusion, "behold your enemies resound and those who hate you raise up their head," since Gottschalk's appeal to God was made with this specific reference. Psalm 82 is a plea for divine help against those enemies seeking to destroy the faithful, who according to the psalmist said: "Come, let us wipe out the holy ones from this nation" and "Let us take possession of the holy place of God" (Ps 82, 5 and 13).⁸⁹ Gottschalk identified Hincmar with the enemies of God in this psalm: he had destroyed the faithful with his false teachings and stolen their holy place, the Archdiocese of Rheims. Seeking protection, the psalmist said to God: "You will pursue them in your tempest and in your wrath confound them . . . Let them be put to shame and dismayed for ever, let them perish. And then let them know that your name is the Lord, and you alone are the most high in all the earth."⁹⁰ According to Gottschalk, Hincmar was an enemy worthy of divine vengeance, an enemy who needed to be stopped from destroying the faithful and holding the "stolen" see of Rheims.

With such images as these—Antichrist, usurper, brigand, and thief—Gottschalk painted his picture of Hincmar for his readers. He encouraged them to believe that God would make things right in the archdiocese by removing their oppressor, putting himself in his place, and then grant him the gift of martyrdom seven years later. That his vision had not come true (presumably by 856–7—approximately three and a half years after the Synod of Soissons, when he may have made the prophecy) clearly saddened Gottschalk and his reader, but it did not change his view of things. He continued to pray to God that the prophecy would come true, according to the divine will, and he sought to remain his faithful servant.

The environment of controversy after the spring of 853 and the intensely personal nature of Hincmar's and Gottschalk's attacks against one another had produced a more vituperative debate from what had been seen before. Gottschalk's criticisms were attracting much more attention than previously, and Gottschalk began to use the situation to portray himself as the leader of resistance against the archbishop. Hincmar's commentary about Gottschalk's prophecy suggests that Gottschalk had readers who were eager to follow his writings and his claims, although what they actually thought about them is difficult to say. Because Gottschalk was *already* condemned to life imprisonment, he found himself in the unique position of being able to speak out against Hincmar in ways that opened

⁸⁸ Hughes, *Constructing*, pp. 139–66; and Palmer, *The Apocalypse*, pp. 167–70.

⁸⁹ Ps 83, 5: "venite et disperdamus eos de gente," with *eos* referring to *sanctos* in the previous line; and Ps 83, 15: "possideamus sanctuarium Dei."

⁹⁰ Ps 82, 14: "sicut stipulam ante faciem venti;" and Ps 82, 16 and 18: "[16] persequeris illos in tempestate tua et in ira tua turbabis eos . . . [18] erubescant et conturbentur in saeculum saeculi et confudantur et pereant [19] et cognoscant quia nomen tibi dominus tu solus altissimus in omni terra."

new possibilities for thinking resistance. As one already punished, Gottschalk could say what others may have thought but could not express about their archbishop, making him the voice of criticism in the turbulent time in the archdiocese after 853. Yet Gottschalk's interest in defying Hincmar did not stop with his controversial self-image. He also urged his readers to disregard the authority of those who rejected his doctrines, and he tried to incite them to debate with anyone who refused to accept them. Gottschalk's plan of resistance against Hincmar, therefore, involved a wider program of defiance, in which his readers would take up his call to defend his doctrines against earthly authorities all the way unto death.

GOTTSCHALK'S *DE TRINA DEITATE*: RESISTANCE TO EARTHLY AUTHORITIES

Gottschalk outlined a justification for defying authorities in his *De trina deitate*. This text also contains arguments about the oneness and triuneness of God in order to convince the reader to avoid the "Arian" and "Sabellian" doctrines of Gottschalk's opponents,⁹¹ and then finishes with excerpts from previous writers as authoritative evidence, including: Fulgentius' *De fide*, Isidore's *Etymologiae*, Alcuin's *De fide sanctae trinitatis*, and Augustine's *De Trinitate*.⁹² Gottschalk's particular argument justifying the disobedience of earthly authority was a unique development of his very particular career, which provides a sustained human story of conflict in connection to the sorts of political arguments developed during the rebellions of Louis the Pious' reign, when, as Mayke de Jong has demonstrated, *scandalum* or offense against God in the form of public crimes was a justifiable reason for rebellion.⁹³ In his *De trina deitate*, Gottschalk called on his readers to see the archbishop as a rebel against God, for whose disobedience to divine power he must be scorned and defied. To build this argument, Gottschalk drew first on the examples of the Apostles Peter and Paul as biblical authorities, stating that earthly powers should be despised when they rejected God's will. Of particular importance was Gottschalk's interpretation of Romans 13, 1–2, which he argued required each Christian to reject authorities disobeying God. He then developed this argument from Augustine's *Sermo* 62, elaborating on it to clarify for his readers the relationship between the worldly hierarchy and their own duty to serve God above all else.

⁹¹ Gottschalk, *De trina deitate*, *CEG*, pp. 98 and 101.

⁹² Gottschalk, *De trina deitate*, *CEG*, pp. 101–30; Fulgentius, *De fide*, 1–2 and 4–6, 11, and 45–7, ed. Jean Fraipont, *CCSL* 91A (Turnhout, 1968), pp. 711–12, 713–16, 718–19, and 742–4; Isidore, *Etymologiae*, VII, 4, ed. Lindsay; Alcuin, *De fide sanctae trinitatis*, I, 2, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14; II, 2–3, 7–8, 13, 15, 19–20, 21; and III, 5–8, *PL* 101: 9–64, here 15, 16–17, 19, 21–2, 24–5, 27–8, 31–2, 33, 35–7, 40–3, 56–8; and Augustine, *De Trinitate*, I, 6, 8–11 and VI, 7, 9, and 12, ed. William J. Mountain, *CCSL* 50 (Turnhout, 1968), pp. 37–40 (some passages omitted), 237–9 and 242–3. Note that only those of Fulgentius and Isidore are attributed to the authors—the passages from Alcuin and Augustine appear under topical headings dealing with various aspects of the Trinity. See also Tavad, *Trina*, pp. 59–60.

⁹³ This is a general theme of de Jong's study, but see especially de Jong, *Penitential*, pp. 153–70, 195–205, and 228–41.

The Apostle Peter served as Gottschalk's first example of a faithful servant of God defying powers rebelling against the divine will. Gottschalk reminded his readers of Peter's reply to the high priests in the Acts of the Apostles when they asked why the apostles preached Christ against the priests' wishes (5, 29): "It is necessary to obey God rather than men."⁹⁴ This exchange took place in the Temple when Peter and the others went there to pray after they had been released from the high priests' prison through divine intervention.⁹⁵ Gottschalk wanted his readers to see that Peter and the other apostles, wrongfully punished by the high priests for preaching the truth and nonetheless persevering in their efforts, were an example to follow: God would help those who resisted even ecclesiastical powers scorning his will.

Gottschalk then turned to Paul's Letter to the Romans (13, 1–2): "May every soul be subject to higher powers . . . He who resists the power of God, resists his order, and those resisting gain damnation for themselves."⁹⁶ Carolingian authors—Alcuin, Jonas of Orléans and Hrabanus—interpreted this passage to mean that one must obey the established authorities of the world as part of the divine hierarchy.⁹⁷ Yet Gottschalk wanted his reader to understand that their opponents were using their authority to defy God and his divine order, and would be damned for it. He created his own argument to explain Paul's statement and to show how one should first try to obey the human hierarchy, but then one must go directly to God if one's superiors resist divine authority:

For example, if your father, who is in the city, is inferior to the judge or viscount and nevertheless wants to oppose them against the law, and you cannot correct your father, then you send your father away and subject yourself to the judge or viscount. If the viscount wishes to oppose the count, then you subject yourself to the count. If the count unjustly wants to oppose the duke then you support the duke. If the duke wants to rebel against the king, then you renounce the duke and aid the king. But if the king wants to oppose the emperor, you leave the king and go to the emperor. If, however, the emperor wishes to sin against God and oppose him—especially if he denies him and orders you to deny him—you ought completely without a doubt to renounce an emperor of this sort and submit yourself with full devotion to the Lord God and commit yourself to him fully. Behold now it is manifestly clear how we ought to understand the opinion of the Apostle Paul and condemn, despise and disregard those earthly forces or petty powers contrary to God, which resist and contradict the highest—that is the divine, one and triune—power.⁹⁸

⁹⁴ Gottschalk, *De trina deitate*, CEG, p. 96: "oboedire oportet deo magis quam hominibus."

⁹⁵ Acts 5, 1–29.

⁹⁶ Gottschalk, *De trina deitate*, CEG, p. 96; and Rom. 13, 1–2: "Omnis anima potestatibus sublimioribus subdita sit . . . Qui resistit potestati dei ordinationi resistit, qui autem resistent ipsi sibi damnationem adquirent."

⁹⁷ Alcuin, *Explanatio in epistolam Pauli ad Titum*, 3, PL 100: 1007–86, here 1022–3; Jonas, *De institutione regia*, 8, ed. Alain Dubreucq (Paris, 1995), p. 222; and Hrabanus, *Enarrationes in epistolas beati Pauli*, VII, 13, PL 111: 1560.

⁹⁸ Gottschalk, *De trina deitate*, CEG, p. 96: "Verbi gratia, si pater tuus qui est in civitate minor est iudice vel vicecomite et tamen eis contra legem vult resistere nec potes tu patrem tuum corrigere, tunc patrem tuum dimitte atque te iudici sive vicecomiti subde, si vicecomes comiti vult resistere tunc te comiti subice, si comes iniuste vult duci repugnare tu duci suffragare, si dux ille vult adversus regem rebellare tu dimisso duce regi auxiliare, si vero rex imperatori vult repugnare tu regem relinque et ad

Gottschalk explained to his reader that Paul's discussion of resisting authority also referred to anyone scorning divine authority, making rebellion against such figures an act of loyalty to God. The highest power—that of God—in the end could not be resisted without eternal damnation, and “petty powers” (*potentioles*) must be resisted if they opposed the “one and triune” power of God.

Gottschalk's interpretation of Romans 13, 1–2 was unusual in the ninth century. Yet it bears a striking similarity to an argument found in Augustine's *Sermo* 62, which states that while every soul submits to earthly power, every earthly power is beneath God.⁹⁹ When worldly powers command idolatry, the church father argued, then no one need obey them. Augustine's remarkable call to defiance is so like Gottschalk's that it must have served as a model for his own:

Am I inciting you to pride, or telling you to adopt an attitude of contempt toward the duly established authorities? That is not what I am saying. Any of you who are not quite sound on this point should touch that hem of the garment. The apostle himself says, “Let every soul be subject to the more eminent authorities, for there is no authority except from God, and those there are have been established by God. But whoever opposes authority opposes the establishment of God” [Rom 13, 1–2]. But what if it orders something you ought not to do? In this case certainly make light of authority by respecting authority. Consider the grading of authority in human affairs. If the curator gives an order, should it not be carried out? However, if his orders go against the ruling of the governor, you are not, surely, showing contempt for authority when you decide to be at the service of the higher one. Nor should the lower authority be angry if the higher is given preference. Again, if the governor himself issues one order and the emperor another, do you hesitate to ignore the former and put yourself at the service of the latter? So finally, if the emperor says one thing and God another, what is your decision? “Pay the tax, put yourself at my disposal.” “Certainly, but not in idolatry. It is forbidden in idolatry.” “Who forbids it?” “A higher authority. Please excuse me, but you threaten me with prison, he with hell.” In this way you now have to take up your faith as a shield, in which you can quench all the fiery darts of the enemy.¹⁰⁰

imperatorem vade, si autem imperator contra deum vult peccare et ipsi repugnare, maxime si ipse eum negat et tibi ut eum neget imperat, tu huius modi funditus, ut sine dubio debes, imperatorem dimitte et domino deo te tota devotione summitte quin et ipsi te pronus omnino committe. Ecce iam claret manifeste qualiter debeamus illam sententiam Pauli apostoli intellegere et istas terrenas potestates immo potentioles deo contrarias, quae summae id est divinae uni et trinae potestati contradicunt et resistunt, contemnere despiciere atque neglegere.”

⁹⁹ Gottschalk, *De trina deitate*, *CEG*, p. 96, note 7; and Augustine, *Sermo* 62, 8, 13, *PL* 38: 420–1.

¹⁰⁰ Augustine, *Sermo* 62, 8, 13, *PL* 38: 420–1: “Numquid in suberbiam vos erigimus, aut dicimus vobis ut adversus potestates ordinatas contemptores sitis? Non hoc dicimus. Qui et hinc aegrotatis, tangite et hinc fibriam illam vestimenti. Ipse dicit apostolus: Omnis anima potestatibus sublimioribus subdita sit: non est enim potestas nisi a deo. Quae autem sunt, a deo ordinatae sunt. Qui autem resistit potestati, Dei ordinationi resistit. Sed quid, si illud jubeat, quod non debes facere? Hic sane contemne potestatem, timendo potestatem. Ipsos humanarum rerum gradus advertite. Si aliquid jusserit curator, nonne faciendum est? Tamen si contra proconsulem jubeat, non utique contemnis potestatem, sed eligis majori servire. Nec hinc debet minor irasci, si major praelatus est. Rursum si aliquid ipse proconsul jubeat, et aliud jubeat imperator, numquid dubitatur isto contempto illi esse serviendum? Ergo si aliud imperator, et aliud Deus, quid judicatis? Solve tributum, esto mihi in obsequium. Recte, sed non in idolio. In idolio prohibet. Quis prohibet? Major potestas. Da veniam: tu carcerem, ille gehennam minatur. Hinc jam tibi assumenda est fides tua tanquam scutum, in quo possis omnia ignite

Augustine's contention—that one should obey worldly authorities, including emperors, unless they order idolatry—offered Gottschalk a way of explaining to his readers why the worldly powers in their time that demand one should deny God through heresy should be resisted. These powers rejected as heretical Gottschalk's divinely-revealed doctrines, wickedly misusing their power, and thereby nullifying their claim to authority. Gottschalk and his supporters *must* defy them, or risk damnation themselves.

Resisting rebellious powers, according to Gottschalk, was necessary no matter what the cost. When he articulated this same argument in one of his grammatical treatises, he told his readers to oppose such petty powers “all the way onto death” (*ad usque mortem*).¹⁰¹ In his *De praedestinatione*, Gottschalk included a diatribe against an unnamed “petty power,” most likely Hincmar, chastising him for rebelling against God in his false beliefs. Calling him a “miserable petty power, inflated bladder, puffed up bag and swollen arrogant carrion hide” (*misella potentiola, inflata vesica, cutis tumida, turgida elata pellis morticina*), he warned the archbishop: “you are utterly ruined by your own vice, villainy, and shameful crime” (*proprio vitio facinore atque flagitio nimis es perditus*).¹⁰² Clearly Gottschalk took great pride in demonstrating to his readers what sort of scorn should be heaped on the archbishop. Hincmar was to be despised and defied, since his episcopal authority was forfeit to God's ultimate power. Ruined by his own crimes, he was nothing more than an empty bag of wind. As in the case of his *examen*, Gottschalk was appealing here to a higher, divine authority as he linked defiance to orthodoxy. By redefining Hincmar's position in the hierarchy of power, he was able to show his reader that God was the real authority to fear, and it was his duty, as his humble servant, to resist the archbishop.

Writing from a Marxist perspective, Epperlein argued that Gottschalk represented social resistance to the Carolingian, “feudal” church, although he did not cite this particular passage in his study.¹⁰³ Yet Epperlein's argument does not fit with the particulars of Gottschalk's interpretation of Romans 13, 1–2. For Gottschalk claimed that the hierarchy *should* be observed—one was to go through each level from father to emperor—and only *after* that had been carried out should one dare to go directly to God. Gottschalk's chief concern was rebellion against heavenly authority in any form. His careful illustration of the hierarchy shows that he reaffirmed rather than rejected it, allowing room for disobedience to superiors *only* in so far as it enabled one to remain faithful to heavenly power. Besides, Gottschalk's prophecy indicated that he expected to become archbishop himself. In this way, Gottschalk sought to prevent his supporters from disregarding God's supremacy as Hincmar and the other bishops had done, but also to keep them from scorning the divinely created order.

jacula inimici extinguere.” Translation adapted from Augustine, *Sermons*, trans. Edmund Hill, *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century* (New York, 1991), III, p. 163.

¹⁰¹ Gottschalk, *Opusculum primum*, CEG, p. 412.

¹⁰² Gottschalk, *De trina deitate*, CEG, pp. 96 and 99.

¹⁰³ Epperlein, *Herrschaft*, pp. 198–9.

DEBATE IN GOTTSCHALK'S *DE PRAEDESTINATIONE*:
RESISTANCE UNTO DEATH

The question remains as to what kind of resistance Gottschalk encouraged his readers to take up. Gottschalk's success following his condemnation at the Synod of Quierzy in 849 had been in furthering controversy and debate, and this is again what he sought to do after 853. He wanted his readers above all to debate with anyone who disagreed with his doctrines, and he outlined how they should do so in his *De praedestinatione*, which is a substantial treatise that encompasses forty folios (57r–96v) in Bern 584.¹⁰⁴ It contains numerous kinds of arguments in support of his predestination doctrine,¹⁰⁵ as well as collections of biblical proof texts gathered to support it.¹⁰⁶ The tone throughout Gottschalk's text is aggressive, meant to inspire confidence and tenacity in his readers so that they would dispute with anyone contradicting his doctrine of predestination—no matter who they were or what it cost. According to Gottschalk, opponents should be defied “no matter how great their talent, authority, fame, holiness, or character.”¹⁰⁷ He stressed that his readers must believe and confess “all the way to death . . . that the Lord suffered only for the elect and redeemed them through the blood of his cross from everything, that is entirely from past, present and future sins.”¹⁰⁸ Such was their duty as God's servants. By debating with opponents, Gottschalk maintained, they could force them through argument to see that their position was untenable. Those who accepted his doctrines as true would be saved, while the rest were damned as heretics—hopelessly lost. By carrying out his instructions, he urged his readers to see that they would remain faithful to divine truth and would help protect the faithful from the attacks of heretics.

As in the case of his *Confessio prolixior*, Gottschalk identified himself and his readers with Augustine. He referred to the church father in the *De praedestinatione* four times as “our Augustine” (*noster Augustinus*), and indicated that their doctrine was no different than his.¹⁰⁹ Following Hincmar's criticisms, Schrörs, Vielhaber, and Mitterauer understood Gottschalk's use of “noster” to mean that he claimed Augustine as his own (“my Augustine”).¹¹⁰ Yet Gottschalk only called Augustine “noster” one other time in his surviving works—in one of his grammatical treatises—and did not do so regularly; here he was probably trying to acknowledge that he and his readers shared a similar knowledge and understanding of the church father's thought that was distinct from their opponents'.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁴ Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, CEG, pp. 180–258.

¹⁰⁵ Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, CEG, pp. 180–97 and 202–58.

¹⁰⁶ Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, CEG, pp. 197–201.

¹⁰⁷ Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, CEG, p. 251: “. . . quantaelibet si indolis auctoritatis famae sanctitatis ingenii . . .”

¹⁰⁸ Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, CEG, p. 229: “. . . usque ad mortem . . . quod pro solis dominus est passus electis et eos per sanguinem crucis suae redemit a cunctis id est a praeteritis et a praesentibus et a futuris omnino peccatis.”

¹⁰⁹ Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, CEG, pp. 220, 225, 228, and 235.

¹¹⁰ Schrörs, *Hincmar*, p. 107; Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, p. 64; and Mitterauer, *Gottschalk*, p. 74.

¹¹¹ Gottschalk, *Opusculum primum*, CEG, p. 380.

The key debate strategy Gottschalk outlined in his *De praedestinatione* was to barrage an opponent with a series of questions to force him into a position where he must either agree or remain silent. To this end, Gottschalk provided the reader with a line of argumentation to help him dominate a debate and overcome opposition. Here, Gottschalk's fierce approach to intellectual confrontations can be gauged. He carefully arranged the questions to force particular answers from the adversary, repeatedly writing that the opponent "must be asked" (*interrogandus est*).¹¹² Imagining the culmination of the debate, Gottschalk gave this particular advice to the reader on how to finish off a foe, expressing his disdain for whoever might resist him:

If you interrogate him wisely about these things, soon you will be astonished that his only reasonable response is that he does not know or he will be mute. I wish to continue, however, by prudently asking that most worthless good-for-nothing, to which of the two worlds he thinks the baptized reprobate belong according to the just judgement of God, either to the reconciled and cleansed world or to the wicked, damned and perversely-born one. If he should say that they belong to the reconciled, saved and cleansed world, you say to him: "Therefore they are reconciled, saved and cleansed through the death of the son of God and for that reason they will be saved from wrath through him?" Because if, whether willing or not, he should see and say that it is not true and through this responds that they belong rather to the wicked, damned and perversely-born world, then you yourself infer consequently and confine him to silence by saying cheerfully and faithfully: "Therefore whether willing or not you are at last compelled to believe, understand and confess that Christ the son of God in no way redeemed through the blood of his cross the baptized reprobate whom he does not hold reconciled, neither perpetually saved nor cleansed."¹¹³

A key expression found in the passage is "whether willing or not" (*volens nolens*), by which Gottschalk meant to stress that even those resisting his position, those "most worthless good-for-nothings," would be forced to see that it was true. This severe style—in which Gottschalk fired questions at an adversary one after the other in rapid succession until the latter was cornered into a position, speechless—presents an alternate approach to Gottschalk's prayer-like tone in the *Confessio prolixior* or his solicitous one in his letters, revealing how he taught his readers to use the debate skills he had honed so well in the 830s and 840s.

¹¹² See especially Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, *CEG*, pp. 229–31.

¹¹³ Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, *CEG*, p. 230: "Haec eum si sapienter sciscitatus fueris, mox illius quod rationabiliter ad ista respondeat ignarum velut mutum miraberis. Addere tamen et istud volo prudenter illum nequissimum nebulonem consulendo, ad quem duorum mundorum reprobos baptizatos pertinere putet iusto dei iudicio, utrum videlicet ad mundum reconciliatum atque mundatum an ad mundum inimicum damnatum inquinatum. Si pertinere dixerit eos ad mundum reconciliatum salvatum atque mundatum, dices ei: Ergo reconciliati salvati atque mundati sunt per mortem filii dei et ideo salvi erunt ab ira per ipsum? Quod si volens nolens viderit atque dixerit non esse verum ac per hoc responderit eos pertinere potius ad mundum inimicum damnatum inquinatum, infer ipse consequenter et eum coartando confuta dicens hilariter atque fidenter: Igitur velis nolis tandem aliquando credere intellegere confiteri cogeris quod Christus filius dei nullo modo per sanguinem crucis suae redemerit reprobos baptizatos quos non habet reconciliatos neque salvatos perpetim neque mundatos."

Gottschalk acknowledged to his readers of the *De praedestinatione* that there would be some who would refuse to accept his doctrine, despite this style of questioning. He told his readers that they were heretics—"enemies of the truth" (*veritatis inimici*), "deniers of the truth" (*negatores veritatis*) and "lovers of falsehood" (*amatores falsitatis*)¹¹⁴—who would suffer God's terrible wrath. Yet despite his anger at their refusal to acknowledge the truth of his teachings, Gottschalk wanted his readers to see that these enemies could at least be forced through argument to remain silent:

Let them diligently attend, wisely consider and prudently examine these and many other testimonies of this kind from sacred scripture. And if they are ashamed and afraid to be called idiots or if they are to be more than frogs (one can see while it thunders they do not make a sound), let them be aroused, wake up and blush at last (if they can) at the above words of sacred scripture, which is called heaven and is thunder—that is if they are not dead but sleeping. Let them blush, I say, let them blush and be silent. "Among the middle lots" [Ps 67, 14] let them sleep, that is let them find comfort in the evidence of the two testaments and at last being pleased with the truth as is to their advantage let them be happy and at peace. Otherwise let them hear that which the blessed Augustine said about heretics: "Heaven thunders—let the frogs be silent." But since these obstinate and overly stubborn individuals—clearly not living but dead—have been abandoned [by God], we must without a doubt not let ourselves perish from their deadly poisons. For those who say that God generally and universally, indifferently and equally wishes all men to be saved and therefore he saves the elect because they wish to be saved and does not save the damned because they do not wish it, they deny the grace of God among the elect and among the damned they unknowingly deny the omnipotence of God.¹¹⁵

Gottschalk's command that his opponents "blush and be silent" is most likely drawn from the *Hypomnesticon*, whose author twice commanded his Pelagian opponents to blush and be silent: "Blush therefore and be silent!" (*Erubescite ergo et conticescite*) and "And blush and be silent at last!" (*et erubescite vel conticescite tandem*).¹¹⁶ Gottschalk encouraged his readers to see that forcing opponents into silence was a way of making them consider that they had no answer to give to counter his argument. Should they then accept his position, Gottschalk claimed, they would be shown to have received the grace to understand that his doctrine was

¹¹⁴ Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, CEG, pp. 214, 220, 227, and 231.

¹¹⁵ Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, CEG, pp. 238–9: "Haec et huiusmodi multa testimonia sacrae scripturae diligenter attendant sapienter appendant prudenter perpendant, et si plus quam ranae sint esse vel dici fatui verecundantur atque formidant quae videlicet dum tonat non sonant, ad supra dicta sacrae scripturae quae caelum vocatur et est tonitrua tandem aliquando si possunt id est si mortui non sunt sed dormiunt excitentur evigilent erubescant. Erubescant inquam erubescant et conticescant. *Inter medios cleros* dormiant id est duorum testamentorum testimoniis adquiescant et tandem veritati sicut eis expedit adquiescentes laeti quiescant. Alioquin illud beati Augustini quod super hereticis ait audiant: *Caelum tonat, ranae taceant*. Sed his omissis obstinatis et nimium duris non videlicet vivis sed mortuis nobis procul dubio necessarium est nimis ut eorum letiferis non perimamur venenis. Namque qui dicunt quod deus qui generaliter et universaliter, indifferenter et aequaliter vult omnes homines salvos fieri propterea salvat electos quia ipsi salvari volunt et ideo non salvat reprobos quia ipsi nolunt, in electis prorsus negant dei gratiam et in reprobis licet nescienter negant dei omnipotentem."

¹¹⁶ Pseudo-Augustine, *Hypomnesticon*, I, 2, ed. Chisolm, p. 107.

correct. To explain this better fate, Gottschalk drew on Augustine's interpretation of Ps 67, 14: "If you sleep among the middle lots, the feathers of a silver dove and on its back the color gold."¹¹⁷ On this passage Augustine wrote that those people described in the Psalm were peacefully waiting between the Old and New Testament, calmly anticipating God's peace at the end of time.¹¹⁸

Gottschalk's opinion about his opponents' chances for such a transformation, however, was quite pessimistic, and he used a composite image of heretics as frogs (from Augustine's works and those wrongly attributed to him) to convey that message. In his *Sermo* 240, in which he was speaking about the resurrection of the body, Augustine castigated pagan philosophers for preferring human wisdom to the message of divine revelation, writing: "The Lord Christ comes, the wisdom of God: *the heavens thunder, let the frogs be silent*. Because the truth has spoken, this is true."¹¹⁹ Gottschalk probably drew the phrase, "Heaven has thundered, let the frogs be silent," from this Augustinian sermon. Yet a sermon falsely attributed to Augustine also offered an exposition of the ten plagues from Exodus, in which the frogs of the second plague were described as heretics:¹²⁰

What is this second plague? An abundance of frogs. In the frogs are heretics and philosophers understood. If you consider the loquacity of the frogs, you have congruently the vanity of the philosophers and heretics signified. For the philosophers and the heretics, because they say that all of the things in Christ are false, are frogs croaking in the slimy swamps. They can have pride, vain contentions and the sound of their voice, [but] they cannot attain the doctrine of wisdom. For those who contradict Christian truth, deceiving and deceived in their own vanity, are frogs bringing weariness to our ears, not food for our minds.¹²¹

Other authors also understood frogs as symbolic of heretics who were damned for refusing to be corrected. A contemporary of Augustine, Eucherius of Lyons (d. ca. 449), wrote in his *Formulae spiritualis intelligentiae*: "Frogs are heretics, who lingering in the filth of the most vile ways of thinking, do not cease to babble falsehoods with their chattering."¹²² Cassiodorus, in his Commentary on Psalm 77 wrote:

¹¹⁷ Ps 67, 14: "si dormiatis inter medios cleros/ pinnae columbae deargentatae/ et posteriora dorsi eius in pallore auri."

¹¹⁸ Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, 67, 17 ed. Dekkers and Fraipont, pp. 868–900, here pp. 880–1.

¹¹⁹ Augustine, *Sermo* 240, 5, *PL* 38: 1130–3, here 1133: "Venit Dominus Christus, sapientia Dei: coelum tonat: ranae taceant. Quod dixit veritas, hoc est verum."

¹²⁰ For the account of the plague of frogs, see Ex 8, 1–14.

¹²¹ Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* 21, 3, *PL* 39: 1783–4: "Quae est ista secunda plaga? Ranarum abundantia. In ranis haeretici intelliguntur atque philosophi. Habes congruenter significatam philosophorum vel haeticorum vanitatem, si consideres ranarum loquacitatem. Philosophi enim vel haeretici, quia in Christo omnia falsa esse dicunt, ranae sunt clamantes in paludibus limosis: superbiam enim, inanes contentiones, et strepitum vocis habere possunt; doctrinam sapientiae insinuare non possunt. Qui enim christianae veritati contradicunt, et in sua vanitate decepti decipiunt, ranae sunt tedium afferentes auribus, non cibum mentibus."

¹²² Eucherius of Lyons, *Formulae spiritualis intelligentiae*, 4, ed. Carmela Mandolfo, *CCSL* 66 (Turnhout, 2004), p. 34: "Item ranae, haeretici, qui in coeno vilissimorum sensuum commorantes, vana garrulitate blaterare non desinant." On Eucherius, see Adalbert Hamman, "The Writers of Gaul," in *Patrology: The Golden Age of Latin Patristic Literature*, ed. Angelo di Berardino, trans. Placid Solari

"The frog is the most loquacious vanity of the heretics, which having lingered in the most filthy ways of thinking, does not cease to babble with wicked cries."¹²³ Hrabanus himself also equated frogs with heretics in his *De universo*, probably drawing on Eucherius, which his account echoes: "Frogs are heretics, who lingering in the filth of the most vile ways of thinking, do not cease from croaking vanities with their chattering, as is read in Exodus."¹²⁴

Gottschalk made it clear to his readers that his calls for them to debate opponents was part of their duty to protect simple believers from heretical beliefs. He characterized the believers of his doctrine as Christ's sheep and anyone who denied it as "a ravenous wolf or shameless old goat" (*rapax lupus vel procax hircus*); he argued that it was the duty of the sheep to respond to the attacks of the wolves "on account of the weak and less able" (*ob infirmos minusque capaces*).¹²⁵ Yet, Gottschalk maintained, Christ ultimately would protect his own (the elect)—for whom he had given his life—from the "plots of the shameless, obstinate, stubborn and ravening wolves" (*insidiae procacium, pertinacium, pervicacium, luporum rapacium*), whom he would move far away from his sheep to perish in Hell.¹²⁶

Gottschalk drew this imagery of the sheep and the goats or wolves from the Gospel of Matthew, where Christ compared false prophets and the enemies of his followers to wolves, saying (Mt 7, 15): "Beware of false prophets who come to you in sheep's clothing, but within they are ravenous wolves,"¹²⁷ and (Mt 10, 16–18): "Behold I send you like sheep in the midst of wolves. Be therefore wise like snakes and as simple as doves. Beware of men! For they will drag you before assemblies and beat you in their synagogues. You will be led to their rulers and to their kings on account of me to testify to these peoples."¹²⁸ This imagery must have been highly significant to Gottschalk, since his enemies were among the highest princes of the church, and he himself had been beaten before kings and assemblies as described in the Gospel. Gottschalk's concern, however, seems to have been with the Last Judgment, as much as with present circumstances. He was reminding his reader of their ultimate victory over their enemies like Hincmar, when Christ would favor the believers of true doctrine rather than the heretics. According to Matthew's Gospel, the Last Judgment would see the separating of the sheep from the goats

(Westminster, MD: 1986), pp. 504–62, here pp. 504–7; Martin Heinzmann, "Eucherius von Lyons," in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 4 (Munich, 1989), pp. 70–1; and Michael McHugh, "Eucherius of Lyons," in *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, ed. Everett Ferguson, 2nd ed. (New York, 1997), I, p. 398.

¹²³ Cassiodorus, *Expositio psalmsorum*, 77, 46, ed. Adriaen, p. 723: "Rana est loquacissima vanitas haereticorum, quae coenosis sensibus commorata, improbis clamoribus garrere non desinit."

¹²⁴ Hrabanus, *In universo libri viginti duo*, VIII, 2, PL 111: 228: "Ranae haeretici, qui in coeno vilissimorum sensuum commorantes, vana garrulitate latrare non desinunt, ut in Exodo legitur."

¹²⁵ Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, CEG, p. 244.

¹²⁶ Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, CEG, p. 244.

¹²⁷ Mt 7, 15: "Adtendite a falsis prophetis qui veniunt ad vos in vestimentis ovium/ intrinsecus autem sunt lupi rapaces."

¹²⁸ Mt 10, 16–18: "Ecce ego mitto vos sicut oves in medio luporum/ estote ergo prudentes sicut serpentes/ et simplices sicut columbae [17] cavete autem ab hominibus/ tradent enim vos in conciliis/ et in synagogis suis flagellabunt vos [18] et ad praesides et ad reges ducemini propter me in testimonium illis et gentibus." See also Lc 10, 3: "Ite ecce ego mitto vos sicut agnos inter lupos."

(Mt 25, 32–3): “And all peoples will be gathered before him and he will separate them from one another, just as a shepherd separates the sheep from the goats, and he will place the sheep on his right side, but the goats on his left.”¹²⁹ With each of these arguments, Gottschalk hoped to convince his readers that Christ would punish their enemies.

In his *De trina deitate* and *De praedestinatione*, Gottschalk’s strategy was to incite further debate and controversy among his readers. Like his criticism of Hincmar in his *schedulae*, Gottschalk used harsher language to describe his enemies and envisioned a campaign of disobedience that was much more disruptive and threatening to Hincmar than what he had advocated before 853. It remains to be asked to what extent any of Gottschalk’s readers responded to his call for resistance. The archbishop’s characterization of his supporters in the late 850s and 860s as *scioli* and *doctores*, trained by Gottschalk, suggests that Hincmar was aware of individuals in the archdiocese who debated these issues with their superiors. The lack of evidence of specific incidents (save for Guntbert, whose story is discussed in Chapter 7) suggests that such episodes were not made public or were of limited large-scale political significance, yet their existence further confirmed Gottschalk’s ability to defy Hincmar and stir up controversy in his see nonetheless. In this way, Gottschalk remained a troubling presence in the archdiocese throughout the decade.

GOTTSCHALK AND PRUDENTIUS OF TROYES IN THE LATE 850s

An important exception to Gottschalk’s anonymous readership was an episcopal correspondent in the debate on predestination after 853: Prudentius of Troyes. This bishop had originally condemned Gottschalk at the Synod of Quierzy in 849, but he became one of Hincmar’s chief opponents on this issue over the course of the following decade. His status, as well as the fact that his metropolitan superior was Wenilo of Sens rather than Hincmar, made Prudentius a potentially important ally outside the archdiocese of Rheims. As in the case of his previous episcopal correspondents and friends, Gottschalk communicated with Prudentius through a verse letter, his *Quo ne tu missus doleas*.¹³⁰ This text is an impressive piece of admonition, with Gottschalk carefully balancing a humble style of address to an episcopal superior with a stern warning that Prudentius’ soul was in peril for not fully accepting his—Gottschalk’s—position on predestination. Gottschalk’s persona in

¹²⁹ Mt 25, 32–3: “Et congregabuntur ante eum omnes gentes/ et sparabit eos ab invicem sicut/ pastor segregat oves ab hedis [33] et statuet oves quidem a dextris suis/ hedos autem a sinistris.” See also for similar imagery Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*, *CEG*, p. 225: “Quod autem filius dei pro solis electis passus fuerit ipse dicit: Animam meam pono pro ovibus meis non videlicet pro hircis vel haedis quod absit alienis.”

¹³⁰ Rädle, “Gottschalks,” pp. 315–25, text on pp. 316–18. For the identification of the text with Gottschalk, see: Ernst Dümmler, “Briefe und Verse des neunten Jahrhunderts,” *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 13 (1888), pp. 345–50; *Epistola* 26, *MGH Epp.* VI, pp. 180–2; and *Versus Godescalci*, *PLAC* IV, pp. 934–6.

the letter clearly reflects how he described himself after 849 and then 853: he claimed to be authoritative on the question of predestination, and to be able, as one of the elect and a special witness to divine revelation, to pray for the bishop's salvation. In this instance, Gottschalk was following the approach he advocated in his other post-853 writings: debating anyone no matter what his rank or holiness. Yet here Gottschalk framed his address carefully to influence someone of superior rank, alternating his tone from one of great humility to one of authority, acknowledging his addressee's high rank and then acting as a patron whose prayers could help him, and even commanding Prudentius for the sake of his salvation to follow his instructions. Gottschalk's hope was to inspire Prudentius to continue to defy the decision of the Synod of Quierzy (853), but to do so in a way that recognized him as the superior doctrinal authority while still making known the truth of omnipotent grace.

Before turning to Gottschalk's verse letter, it is important to establish the details of Prudentius' career and how he became Hincmar's opponent. Prudentius first appears as Louis the Pious's palace clerk, who wrote the *Annales Bertiniani* from 835 to 861 and who served as Bishop of Troyes from 844 to 861.¹³¹ Our evidence for his transformation from opponent to advocate of twin predestination is found in the annals, which Hincmar took over after the bishop's death in 861:

Prudentius, Bishop of the city of Troyes, born Galindus, Spanish by nation, exceedingly erudite in letters, died. Some years before he had resisted Gottschalk the predestinarian; but later, stirred up with bile against certain bishops resisting the heretic with him, he was a most bitter defender of this heresy, constantly writing not a few things about it that were contrary to and against the faith. And so, as one worn out with a long disease, he made an end of living so and writing.¹³²

Prudentius' involvement in the predestination controversy after Gottschalk's condemnation began either in that same year or early in 850, when he responded to a letter from Hincmar, supporting a doctrine of predestination in which only grace could allow the elect to be saved.¹³³ As Felix Rädle has noted, however, Prudentius differed from Gottschalk in that he wrote how God's predestination meant that punishment was only prepared for those who would sin.¹³⁴ In 851, Prudentius composed a lengthy treatise against Eriugena's work on predestination.¹³⁵ Prudentius emphasized that the knowledge enabling a human being to do good came from

¹³¹ Manitius, *Geschichte*, pp. 344–5 and 348; Janet Nelson, "Annals," pp. 26–33; and Wielfaert, *Prudentius*, pp. 11–40.

¹³² *Annales Saint-Bertin*, s.a. 861, ed. Grat et al., pp. 84–5: "Galindo cognomento Prudentius Trecasinae civitatis episcopus, natione Hispanus, adprime litteris eruditus, qui ante aliquot annos Gotescalco praedestinatio restiterat, post, felle commotus contra quosdam episcopos secum haeretico resistentes ipsius haeresis defensor acerrimus, indeque non modica inter sese diversa et fidei adversa scriptitans, moritur; sicque, licet diutino langore fatigaretur, ut vivendi ita et scribendi finem fecit." See also: Nelson, *Annals*, p. 94, note 3.

¹³³ Prudentius, *Epistola*, PL 115: 971–1008; Devisse, *Hincmar*, p. 141; Ganz, "Theology," p. 771; Tavad, *Trina*, p. 48; and Wielfaert, *Prudentius*, pp. 130–73.

¹³⁴ Rädle, "Gottschalks," p. 322; and Prudentius, *Epistola*, PL 115: 976.

¹³⁵ Prudentius, *De praedestinatione*, PL 115: 1009–1366; Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 149 and 152–3; Tavad, *Trina*, p. 48; Petitmengin, "D'Augustin à Prudence," pp. 229–51; and Wielfaert, *Prudentius*, pp. 174–212.

God's grace, and he conducted a historical examination of God's punishment of evil rulers.¹³⁶ In this work, Prudentius defended Gottschalk's position, although he denied that he supported any kind of "Gottschalkian heresy" as described by Eriugena, in which God supposedly compelled the damned to sin.¹³⁷ That Prudentius' metropolitan superior was Archbishop Wenilo of Sens, placed him in a position where he could speak critically with less fear of reprisal.¹³⁸ In addition to writing his own treatise against Eriugena, Prudentius and Wenilo also sought out the help of Florus of Lyons, who then composed his work against Eriugena.¹³⁹

Prudentius, however, did not directly challenge Hincmar at this time. He was present at the Synod of Quierzy in 853, where Hincmar's Four Chapters were passed.¹⁴⁰ Either these four points were vague enough not to conflict with the bishop's views, or he was, more likely, unwilling to voice his opposition at the synod. Yet Prudentius' resistance was soon encouraged by the Synod of Valence in 855, which condemned the Four Chapters.¹⁴¹ Prudentius began his open opposition to Hincmar's doctrine at a meeting of the bishops of the archdiocese of Sens to elect a new Bishop of Paris in 856. While he did not attend the gathering allegedly because of illness, Prudentius demanded in a letter that Aeneas, the royal notary who was to be ordained and who had interrogated Gottschalk at his condemnation in 849, agree to four propositions which were quite contrary to the Four Chapters of Quierzy: free will only functioned with the help of divine grace, predestination was twin, Christ's blood was spilt for those who believe in him, and no one could be saved except those destined by God.¹⁴² With these propositions, Prudentius defined his position more clearly as irreconcilable with Hincmar's, and the rift between them was now public. It seems quite likely that Prudentius avoided the assembly to prevent a direct confrontation there, rather than from a genuine illness, since engaging in an open battle at the controversy could have led to some form of discipline by the other bishops.

Prudentius remained an opponent of Hincmar through the late 850s until his death in 861. It was during this period of open disagreement between the two that Gottschalk wrote his verse letter to Prudentius. Evidence for this dating comes from the fact that Gottschalk mentioned in the text that Prudentius was involved in "quarrels" (*iurgia*) that continued up to the time of writing, which occurred only after Prudentius made his demand about Aeneas and his Four Chapters in 856. Thereafter Hincmar reacted severely against him in his second (lost) predestination

¹³⁶ Ganz, "Predestination," pp. 293–4; and Prudentius, *De praedestinatione*, PL 115: 1045 and 1081.

¹³⁷ Rädle, "Gottschalks," pp. 321–2; and Prudentius, *De praedestinatione*, PL 115: 1021 and 1046.

¹³⁸ Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 200–1; and Roger Reynolds, "The Organization, Law and Liturgy of the Western Church, 700–900," in *NCMH*, pp. 587–621, here 593.

¹³⁹ Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 187–91.

¹⁴⁰ *MGH Conc.* III, No. 28 [Quierzy, Spring 853], pp. 294–8; Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 126–33; Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 199–205; and Ganz, "Predestination," p. 297.

¹⁴¹ *MGH Conc.* III, No. 33 [Valence, 855], pp. 347–65; Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 133–7; McKeon, "The Carolingian Councils," pp. 94–7; Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 214–24; and Tavard, *Trina*, pp. 34–5.

¹⁴² Prudentius, *Epistola ad Wenilonem*, PL 115: 1365–8; Hincmar, *Liber*, PL 125: 182; Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 138–40; McKeon, "Councils," pp. 92 and 101–2; and Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 221–2.

treatise. Therefore Gottschalk's letter probably stems from not long after this exchange.

Felix Rädle has made a convincing case that Prudentius was the recipient of *Quo ne tu missus doleas*.¹⁴³ From the text of the letter, it is clear that the addressee was a bishop, who was mostly in agreement with Gottschalk's doctrine of twin predestination.¹⁴⁴ Rädle demonstrates that Prudentius defended a position quite similar to Gottschalk's in his letter to Hincmar and Pardulus in 850 and his text against Eriugena in the following year.¹⁴⁵ Another key piece of evidence is found in the verse letter, where Rädle argues that Gottschalk made a pun on Prudentius' name, which was derived from the word *prudentia* (wisdom), calling his reader one "brought forth to be especially furnished with the highest wisdom" (*summa specialiter esse sophia praeditus effereris*) and a son of "mother wisdom" (*sapientia mater*).¹⁴⁶ Rädle notes that both Pope Leo IV and Walahfrid Strabo had previously made similar puns on Prudentius' name.¹⁴⁷ All of this evidence, plus Gottschalk's own use of a pun on Hrabanus' name earlier in his *Confessio prolixior*, makes a strong case that Prudentius was the addressee.

The letter is unfortunately incomplete: at line 94 the text breaks off, leaving us without its ending.¹⁴⁸ What survives can be divided into two parts: an opening consisting of a short, unmarked quotation from Augustine's *De civitate Dei* (also containing a quotation of Revelation) which concerns itself with divine predestination;¹⁴⁹ and ninety-four lines of hexameter in which Gottschalk appealed to Prudentius to change his opinion about predestination and to correct one of his texts accordingly.¹⁵⁰ The opening passage from Augustine and Revelation is highly significant to Gottschalk's message. Gottschalk quoted: "For when the holy Apostle John made known, saying: 'and each were judged according to their deeds,' he briefly added how they were judged: 'Both death and hell,' he said, 'were sent into the pool of fire.'" ¹⁵¹ Augustine, in the following line of his text, explained that "death and hell" referred to the devil and his company of demons, since he was the author of death and hell.¹⁵² Yet developing a syllogism out of these authorities, Gottschalk interpreted this passage not only in terms of the devil and his demons, but also of the reprobate as a whole, and used it to warn Prudentius that his salvation was at stake.

¹⁴³ Rädle, "Gottschalks," pp. 321–5.

¹⁴⁴ Rädle, "Gottschalks," pp. 316–17.

¹⁴⁵ Rädle, "Gottschalks," pp. 321–2, who makes reference to Prudentius, *Epistola*, PL 115: 976 and id., *De praedestinatione*, PL 115: 1021 and 1046.

¹⁴⁶ Rädle, "Gottschalks," pp. 317 and 323–4.

¹⁴⁷ Rädle, "Gottschalks," pp. 324; Leo IV, *Epistola ad Prudentium*, MGH Epp. V, p. 611: "Cognoscat prudentia sanctitatis tuae..." and Walahfrid, *Ad Prudentium magistrum*, PLAC II, p. 403: "Nominis alma tui... origo."

¹⁴⁸ Rädle, "Gottschalks," p. 318.

¹⁴⁹ Rädle, "Gottschalks," p. 316; Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, XX, 15, ed. Dumbart, pp. 441–2; and Rev 20, 13.

¹⁵⁰ Rädle, "Gottschalks," pp. 316–18.

¹⁵¹ Rädle, "Gottschalks," p. 316: "Cum enim premitteret sanctus iohannes apostolus dicens: 'et iudicati sunt singuli secundum facta sua,' breviter subiunxit, quemadmodum fuerint iudicati: 'Et mors et infernus,' inquit, 'missi sunt in stagnum ignis.'"

¹⁵² Augustine, *De civitate*, XX, 15, ed. Dumbart, pp. 441–2.

In the body of the letter, Gottschalk began his strategy of alternating humble address with stern warnings to make this point. He sympathized with Prudentius' difficulties with Hincmar, but warned him that he must correct his "little book" (*libellus*), or suffer eternal damnation. Gottschalk praised Prudentius as a "great father" (*tantus pater*) who could be one of the heavenly citizens, but then warned him that his status as bishop would not save him, since Christ wanted to damn those bishops who harmed the elect. Gottschalk then inserted himself as an intercessor, saying that he would pray for grace so that Prudentius could do what he needed, and then pledged his love for him.¹⁵³

Gottschalk's dizzying blend of authority and humility served to emphasize the relationships among himself, Prudentius, and God: God was the eternal judge, but also the giver of grace who placed love for the bishop in Gottschalk's heart and made him Prudentius' friend and advisor. Should the bishop want to be among the elect at the end of time when he stood before God, then he must do as Gottschalk recommended. In this way, Gottschalk cast himself as an advisor of bishops as he had in his earlier writings to Hrabanus, Hincmar, and Amolo. Yet Gottschalk also claimed to understand Prudentius' difficult situation as one who had suffered because of his efforts to be faithful to God. In other words, he acknowledged Prudentius' struggle as a fellow servant of God, but one who needed to correct a mistake. Further cementing his image of the hierarchical relationships, Gottschalk characterized Prudentius as God's client (*cliens*), who despite his youthful mistakes—quite likely referring to his participation in the Synod of Quierzy in 849 and perhaps in 853—had been "saved from the signs of the times," filled with the "sacred gifts" of grace, and freely (not by merit) allowed to drink from "the flowing abundance of [God's] font."¹⁵⁴ Gottschalk wanted Prudentius to see that he had been rescued by God from the errors of his contemporaries, but he still had more to do in order to be saved.

Gottschalk then turned to his first point of concern, which was that Prudentius should accept his understanding on predestination with regard to punishment of the damned:

From your part, such things are only given as reward or punishment.
 You accept that the disciples of perdition
 Are not predetermined to be cast down to Tartarus below,
 When it is established that those sent by him are already cast down,
 We read, believing with our whole heart open.
 As we know that the elect are freely located in the light of paradise—
 Thus the wicked are driven into the abyss by merit.
 The worker of clay does as he wishes, and why does
 A murmuring evil figurine presume to oppose this?
 But I confess that those divinely foreknown to be evil
 Wish to do shameful things of their own will:
 For this they fell into the abyss foredamned

¹⁵³ Gottschalk, *Quo ne tu missus*, lines 1–24, ed. Rädle, pp. 316–17.

¹⁵⁴ Gottschalk, *Quo ne tu missus*, lines 30–8, ed. Rädle, p. 317.

By the just and good judgement of the heavenly king.
 You, however, contrarily assert that for them such
 Torments are only prepared, as if the [wicked] do not exist
 Predetermined, prefixed and prepared ahead for these [punishments],
 When they are plainly believed to be, manifestly understood to be,
 Clearly proven to be and openly convicted as
 Damned, sent forth and ordained ahead of time.
 Whoever has this vision, not only discerns it,
 [But] above all exclaims it so and not otherwise,
 Protests, repeats, testifies and shows it thus,
 As if nothing could ever be more certain to him.
 But you, who are brought forth to be especially furnished
 With the highest wisdom, confess that it is not so.¹⁵⁵

Gottschalk's characterization captures the bishop's description of predestination as God working out his judgments in time with eternal rewards in store for the elect and torments for the damned.¹⁵⁶ Gottschalk's concern here was that Prudentius drew too great a distinction between foreknowledge and predestination, which had been a key issue in the debate from the beginning. Gottschalk also contrasted Prudentius' fame for wisdom with the fact that the bishop did not accept his doctrine entirely. Anyone with understanding (*visus*), he argued, should proclaim and confess it, and argue with those who disagreed—a clear parallel with his message in *De praedestinatione*. Gottschalk encouraged Prudentius not only to accept his position completely, but also to defend it vigorously, here using a combination of praise and shame to make his point by acknowledging Prudentius' renowned wisdom while chastising him for failing to see the truth. In the next lines, Gottschalk even asserted that God would doubtlessly reform his reader with grace, which would enable him to emend his book while there was still time.¹⁵⁷

Gottschalk's second major point of concern was that Prudentius should use his position as bishop to spread his doctrine, emphasizing his crucial pastoral duty to save souls. He wrote that Prudentius should pluck out "depraved saplings" (*prava sata*) growing in the field, whose spines and thorns were pricking the wicked, who foolishly believed that they drew "rich delights" (*opimae deliciae*) from them.¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁵ Gottschalk, *Quo ne tu missus*, lines 39–65, ed. Rädle, p. 317: "Cui de parte tua modo talia sunt retributa,/ Inficieris uti, quod perditionis alumni/ Non sint prefixi sub tartara precipitandi,/ Cum constet missos et eo iam precipitatos,/ Ut legimus patulo credentes pectore toto./ Gratis ut electos paradise in luce locatos,/ Sic merito reprobos in abyssum scimus adactos./ Figulus ipse luti, ceu vult, facit, et quid iniqui/ Murmur figmenti presumit ad ista reniti?/ Ast ego prescitos fateor divinitus ipsos/ Ad facienda malos proprio probra velle futuros:/ Hinc predampnatos in abyssum precipitatos/ Regis iudicio superi probo sat quoque iusto./ Tu tamen econtra peribes, his esse parata/ Tantum tormenta, existent quasi non et in ipsa/ Hii prefiniti, prefixi preque parati,/ Cum predamnati, premissi, precipitati/ Credantur plane, cognoscantur manifeste,/ Probenitur clare seu convincantur aperte./ Quisquis habet visum, non tantum cernit id ipsum,/ Insuper exclamat, quod sic est nec secus extat,/ Increpat, ingeminate, testator et hoc ita monstrat,/ Certius esse quasi nil umquam quiverit ipsi./ At tu, qui summa specialiter esse Sophia/ Praeditus effereris, minime sic esse fateris."

¹⁵⁶ Ganz, "Predestination," pp. 293–4; and Rädle, "Gottschalks," p. 322.

¹⁵⁷ Gottschalk, *Quo ne tu missus*, lines 72–81, ed. Rädle, p. 318.

¹⁵⁸ Gottschalk, *Quo ne tu missus*, lines 81–91, ed. Rädle, p. 318.

Gottschalk was referring here to his opponents' doctrines of predestination, whose influence on his contemporaries troubled him with a "sad heart" (*tristia exta*).¹⁵⁹ Adopting the tone he often used when instructing his followers, he wrote: "Say therefore to them, whom do they believe and whom do they confess to be the author of those supposedly useful flowers—as if they offered life-giving nourishment to their spirits . . ." ¹⁶⁰ Using the Pauline idea of believing and confessing, Gottschalk meant to imply that these misguided individuals believed and confessed Hincmar's doctrines instead of Christ's, and Prudentius' task was to save these lost souls through preaching and confrontation.

At this point, Gottschalk's text breaks off and we have no further record of the correspondence between him and the bishop. That Prudentius remained an active opponent of Hincmar until his death in 861 is clear. We do not, however, know Prudentius' reaction to Gottschalk's demands that he completely accept his position on predestination. Hincmar's annal account of Prudentius as a staunch defender of twin predestination may indicate that Gottschalk was successful, although Prudentius' Four Chapters demonstrate that he had already accepted the "twin" aspect of Gottschalk's doctrine before he received the letter. It is important to remember that Prudentius had developed his doctrines on predestination after 849 based on his own careful examination of the authorities, and he was, therefore, not a follower of Gottschalk like his anonymous correspondents, but a seasoned theologian himself. The sources do not reveal that Prudentius worked to have Gottschalk released from Hautvillers or whether he responded to his letter. Yet Gottschalk's correspondence with Prudentius—like his other writings to friends, bishops, and anonymous followers—shows his determination to claim for himself an authoritative role in terms of questions of orthodoxy as well as resistance to Hincmar and his heresy. In Gottschalk's eyes, even a sympathetic bishop and fellow opponent to Hincmar must accept his doctrine as the orthodox understanding of divine grace, or be revealed to be a reprobate enemy of Christ.

CONCLUSION

Gottschalk's activities in the 850s revealed him to be a determined and even emboldened opponent to Archbishop Hincmar, one whose mission to separate the elect from the reprobate through the belief and confession of orthodox concepts such as *praedestinatio gemina* and *trina deitas* continued unabated during those years. He took every opportunity to fuel those doctrinal controversies through a series of arguments and subversive claims about himself and Hincmar that joined his understanding of election with resistance to heresy in a compelling theology of dissent. Indeed, it was through these controversies that

¹⁵⁹ Gottschalk, *Quo ne tu missus*, line 91, ed. Rädle, p. 318.

¹⁶⁰ Gottschalk, *Quo ne tu missus*, lines 92–4, ed. Rädle, p. 318: "Dic illis igitur, cui credunt quemque fatentur/ Auctorem horum velut utilium fore florum/ Vitalem pastum quasi spiritibus referentum."

Gottschalk was able continually to make himself into a focal point for resistance by indicating how his status as a persecuted, but faithful defender of orthodoxy raised him to a position of authority. This performance of authoritative resistance made Gottschalk a shaper of anti-Hincmarian sentiments in the archdiocese to the extent that he was able to extend his influence to readers throughout the realm even from his cell at Hautvillers. In this way, Gottschalk remained a very active presence in these debates despite his condemnation for heresy and incarceration.

Of particular importance not only to Carolingian, but also to medieval Christian history are this chapter's examinations of Gottschalk's arguments for resistance to the church hierarchy. He sought to discredit Hincmar as a heretical usurper and Antichrist, providing his readers with a set of corrosive and damning images that gave a definite form to any general sense of resentment against their archbishop. For those sympathetic to the suffering of Gottschalk or the Ebbo clerics, these images gave Hincmar's apparent tyranny a dramatic and apocalyptic character that only further heightened their sense of being oppressed. Drawing on an Augustinian sermon against idolatry as an example, Gottschalk taught his readers that it was absolutely incumbent upon them to resist heretical earthly powers working against divine authority. Indeed, the elect had to defend the sheep from those reprobate wolves such as Hincmar who sought to destroy the faithful with his errors. In addition to this justification for open dissent against wicked hierarchical forces, Gottschalk also provided his readers with a series of ruthless arguments designed to destroy all opposition through his particular brand of logic and textual authority. He called on them to resist heretics all the way onto death, sparing no opponent no matter what their rank or apparent holiness. Either such enemies would be convinced of their own foolish and untenable position and saved from error, or they would be left speechless and unable to defend their heresy any further and at least not pervert the faithful with their teachings.

Gottschalk's leaflet literature provides a fascinating window into an unusual and lively underground intellectual culture, one in which young monks and clerics debated theology, argued about the corrupt rule of bishops and speculated about the possibility of salvation in a world where the lines between heresy and orthodoxy were being drawn in the sharpest terms. While this audience remains largely anonymous and inaccessible to us, both Gottschalk's and Hincmar's writings indicate that his unknown correspondents were fully engaged in these controversies in a previously unrecognized way. In addition, these texts suggest that doctrinal debate occurred on multiple levels in the churches and monasteries of Francia in the 850s, when not only named and recognized theologians and bishops but also numerous unnamed thinkers struggled to find answers to these essential, yet troubling questions. The rapid development of such a textual community surrounding Gottschalk and his ideas suggests very much that Carolingian monastic and clerical culture was a fertile place for such exchanges in ways that have not been noticed before. In particular, such lower-order intellectual activity reveals very much the successes as well as the hazards of the Carolingian education reforms.

Now—in addition to a select elite group of trusted thinkers and bishops determining questions of orthodoxy based on the study of scripture, patristics and church tradition—unauthorized persons were able to investigate and debate these questions despite having been forbidden to do so. In this way, Gottschalk's defiant textual community reveals an unanticipated degree of diversity and complexity in Carolingian intellectual activity existing very much outside of any official channels or accepted venues.

Resisting Heresy unto Death in the 860s

Despite the end of the doctrinal controversies about predestination and the triune deity, Gottschalk remained unrepentant and committed to resisting Archbishop Hincmar until his death in the late 860s. In fact, in 861—the year following the Synod of Tusey—the archbishop himself set in motion a series of events that would give Gottschalk and his followers an opportunity to act: Hincmar excommunicated Bishop Rothad of Soissons for allegedly mismanaging his see and then arranged for him to be deposed the following year by a council of bishops; yet Rothad soon reached over Hincmar's head by appealing to Pope Nicholas to be reinstated, which subsequently happened in 865. The Ebbo clerics, whose deposition Rothad seems to have resisted in 853, soon sought papal reinstatement as well, while in 866 Gottschalk's supporter Guntbert fled Hautvillers with the intention of bringing his master's case to Pope Nicholas, who reportedly was sympathetic to his teachings of twin predestination. Indeed, Pope Nicholas could have proved a powerful ally to Gottschalk, and his alleged sympathy with his doctrine offered the greatest possibility for hurtling Gottschalk and the question of grace back into the public eye. Yet the pope's death in 867, followed by Gottschalk's within the next few years, ended the chance of renewed controversy over predestination. Nevertheless, this late appeal to Rome reflects Gottschalk's continuing significance on the broader stage of church politics even in his last years.

Yet Gottschalk also found ways of opposing Hincmar within Hautvillers at this time. Combining his skills as a theologian and grammarian, he focused on the archbishop's liturgical reforms for Rheims and wrote a lengthy critique of Hincmar's revised antiphonary, claiming that it was filled with heretical and blasphemous corruptions. Gottschalk's criticisms transformed the archbishop's reforms, which in part were designed to promote his see as the rightful place for Frankish kings to be anointed, into further evidence of heretical tyranny, while his corrections of Hincmar's text were meant to protect his Hautvillers supporters from the danger of the archbishop's liturgical heresy. Gottschalk also remained true to his doctrines and his claims about his election until his death, when Hincmar offered him one last chance to recant. In what was probably his last writing, Gottschalk scorned the archbishop while praying for divine grace as an unmerited reward for his unfeigning loyalty to God. In this way, Gottschalk shaped his passing from this world into a final act of pious dissent against his heretical enemy. The monks of Hautvillers supported his activities up to his death and, as the Hautvillers *neкроlogium* indicates, they then prayed for his soul despite his condemnation.

GOTTSCHALK, ROTHAD OF SOISSONS, AND
POPE NICHOLAS I IN THE 860s

Pope Nicholas I (858–67) took an interest in Gottschalk's case in 864, after Bishop Rothad, who had been first excommunicated by Hincmar in 861 for showing disobedience to his metropolitan superior and then deposed in 862 by a council of bishops, appealed to him for help in recovering his see.¹ Rothad's petition led the pope to cast his eye on other cases from Hincmar's archdiocese, in particular that of the Ebbo clerics and Gottschalk. When Gottschalk's follower Guntbert discovered an entry in Prudentius' annals stating that the pope confirmed the twin nature of predestination, he hastened to Rome from Hautvillers in 866 to secure the pope's support for his teacher. At this same time, the Ebbo clerics were appealing to Nicholas that their case be reopened, and Hincmar found himself on the defensive again.

Rothad may have advocated for Gottschalk with Nicholas in Rome, when the pope restored him to his office in 865.² Rothad, as the episcopal protector of the monasteries in his diocese, probably knew about Gottschalk's writing activities after his incarceration and may even have been the addressee of some of his texts.³ The letter evidence suggests that Rothad was under surveillance by Hincmar's agents after his resistance to the deposing of the Ebbo clerics in 853, and the fact that he was excommunicated in 861 and then deposed in 862 for the vague reason of mismanaging his see may indicate that he was seen as a supporter or ally of Gottschalk in some way.⁴ Presumably Hincmar felt able to move against his insubordinate suffragan once the predestination controversy had been brought to an end. Particularly interesting for Rothad's possible connections to Gottschalk is the archbishop's evaluation of Rothad in the *Annales Bertiniani*, which very much casts him in the same light as the condemned heretic: Rothad was a "a man of singular madness" (*homo singularis amentie*), who showed "contumacy" (*contumacia*) like "another Pharaoh in the hardness of his heart" (*novus Pharaon propter sui cordis durtiam*) and became "a man turned into a beast" (*homo mutatus in beluam*), since "he did not want to be corrected" (*quoniam corrigi noluit*).⁵

Hincmar wrote to Nicholas early in 864 to address the controversy surrounding Rothad, including a short section explaining the history of Gottschalk's case and the danger he still presented.⁶ According to the archbishop, Gottschalk's doctrines were a revival of the fictitious ancient heresy, the "Old Predestinarians" (*veteres*

¹ *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 861, 862, 863, 864, and 865, ed. Grat et al., pp. 86–7, 91–2, 98, 112, and 118–19. Devisse, *Hincmar*, p. 200.

² Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 237–70; and Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 583–600.

³ Devisse, *Hincmar*, p. 200.

⁴ Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 201 and 583–4; *MGH Conc.* IV, No. 10 [Pîtres—Soissons, 862], pp. 90–122, here 91 and 96; *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 862, ed. Grat et al., pp. 91–2; Nelson, *Annals*, pp. 96, note 12 and 100–1; ead., "Not Bishops' Bailiffs but Lords of the Earth," in *The Frankish World, 750–900*, pp. 133–44, here p. 134; and *The Lives of the Ninth-Century Popes*, trans. and comm. Davis, pp. 194–7 and p. 234, note 121.

⁵ *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 862, ed. Grat et al., pp. 91–2.

⁶ Hincmar, *Epistola* 169, *MGH Epp.* VIII, pp. 144–63.

Praedestinatiani),⁷ and he emphasized the canonical nature of the synods in 848 and 849 which condemned Gottschalk, explaining that Gottschalk remained incarcerated for his lack of repentance and for the protection of the simple and devout.⁸ Hincmar also stressed that Gottschalk's bishop, Rothad was deemed incapable of resisting him and was feared by the archbishop to be a lover of "novelties"—further suggesting that the bishop was at least sympathetic to Gottschalk's teachings.⁹ While Hincmar held out the possibility that Gottschalk could be restored to communion should he reform, the archbishop was not optimistic.¹⁰ Hincmar also gave several reasons why Gottschalk could not be sent to the pope or to another synod for a hearing: Gottschalk was a monk being correctly punished according to the Rule; the canonical decision of the bishops at Quierzy could not be overturned; and the condemned man was dangerous because he could portray himself as orthodox through manipulating textual authorities, especially because "he could recite all day long without taking a breath not only the scriptures from memory, violently twisted to his own sense, but also the mutilated sayings of the catholic [fathers]."¹¹ The archbishop emphasized that Gottschalk had already seduced many, and allowing him the freedom to travel to Rome or to another synod would only risk the loss of countless other souls to his heresy.¹²

None of Nicholas' surviving letters respond to Hincmar's message, making it difficult to say how he handled the matter. Yet another source indicates that Nicholas held his own views about twin predestination, which suggests that he might have been interested at least to hear Gottschalk's side of the debate. Before his death in 861, Prudentius recorded in his annals for the year 859 that the pope had confirmed the twin nature of predestination: "Nicholas, the Roman pontiff, faithfully confirms and catholicly decrees about the grace of God, free will, the truth of twin predestination and the blood of Christ—that it was poured out for all believers."¹³ Whether Prudentius had been in contact with Nicholas, or had simply heard a report about the pope's opinion on the issue, is impossible to tell. Nevertheless, the pope's apparent interest in the debate could have caused the controversy to flare up again, which was something that Hincmar wanted to avoid at all costs.

Though Nicholas does not appear to have acted further, this was not the end of the affair. When Hincmar took over authorship of Prudentius' annals some time in

⁷ Hincmar, *Epistola* 169, *MGH Epp.* VIII, pp. 161–2; and Chazelle, *Crucified God*, p. 166.

⁸ Hincmar, *Epistola* 169, *MGH Epp.* VIII, pp. 160–1.

⁹ Hincmar, *Epistola* 169, *MGH Epp.* VIII, p. 161.

¹⁰ Hincmar, *Epistola* 169, *MGH Epp.* VIII, p. 161.

¹¹ Hincmar, *Epistola* 169, *MGH Epp.* VIII, p. 162: "quia non solum scripturas ad suum sensum violenter inflexas, sed et catholicorum dicta detruncata per totum diem sine respiratione aliqua praevaleret memoriter decantare."

¹² Hincmar, *Epistola* 169, *MGH Epp.* VIII, pp. 162–3.

¹³ *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 859, ed. Grat et al., p. 82: "Nicholaus pontifex Romanus de gratia Dei et libero arbitrio, de veritate geminae praedestinationis et de sanguine Christi, ut pro credentibus omnibus fusus sit, fideliter confirmat et catholice decernit." McKeon, "Councils," p. 105 suggested the entry was fabricated, a view which was criticized by Nelson, *The Annals*, pp. 31–2, who also cites David Ganz, review of Devisse, *Hincmar*, in *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 57 (1979), pp. 711–18.

the 860s,¹⁴ he regarded the entry about Nicholas as a lie.¹⁵ But the news of the pope's confirmation of twin predestination soon became known to Gottschalk and his supporters, and his follower Guntbert left Hautvillers in 866 with the intention of securing papal aid.¹⁶ He may not have travelled south alone. For the Ebbo clerics were seeking Nicholas' help to be restored to their offices like Rothad,¹⁷ and Guntbert may have journeyed to Italy in their company.

The specter of papal intervention in Gottschalk's case again loomed before Hincmar. The archbishop wrote a pair of letters to his ally, Egil of Sens, who acted as his emissary to the pope in 866 in the affair of the Ebbo clerics, with the hope that he would convince Nicholas that Gottschalk should remain at Hautvillers.¹⁸ Egil had been a friend of Hrabanus and was the former Abbot of Prüm and Flavigny, becoming Archbishop of Sens in 865, when he replaced Wenilo—one of Hincmar's chief episcopal rivals in the 850s.¹⁹ Previously Hincmar and Wenilo had struggled to make their sees the most important in Charles the Bald's realm. While Hincmar remained loyal during the invasion of 858, Wenilo sided with Louis the German, but was then reconciled with Charles in the following year after being threatened with the loss of his see.²⁰ With Egil's ascension, however, the tension between the two sees ended. He did not continue his predecessor's rivalry with Hincmar and even acted as his envoy to Nicholas in 866 when the controversy of the Ebbo clerics was at its height.²¹

Since Nicholas seemed to be helping many of Hincmar's opponents, Guntbert may have hoped that he would change Gottschalk's circumstances. Hincmar's letters to Egil reveal the details of the monk's flight and he warned Egil that Guntbert's departure must remain secret "lest a scandal break out."²² Hincmar explained that Guntbert had fled from Hautvillers with books, vestments, horses, and whatever he could carry.²³ According to Hincmar, he had been Gottschalk's familiar and a "depraved" follower of his doctrines, and after being punished several times for his crimes he was finally "sent forth" (*missus*) according to the Rule—a sentence that suggests Hincmar's direct intervention at Hautvillers.²⁴ This probably means that Guntbert was exiled from the monastery (following the

¹⁴ Nelson, *Annals*, pp. 9–13.

¹⁵ François Ganshof, "Notes critiques sur les *Annales Bertiniani*," in *Mélanges F. Grat*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1949), II, pp. 159–74; Leon Levillain, *Introduction to Annales de Saint-Bertin*, ed. Grat et al., pp. xviii–xix; and Nelson, "Annals," p. 31, n. 56.

¹⁶ Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, pp. 27–8; and Devisse, *Hincmar*, p. 610.

¹⁷ Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 237–92; and Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 582–635.

¹⁸ Hincmar, *Epistolae* 187–8, *MGH Epp.* VIII, pp. 194–6 and 200–1.

¹⁹ Duchesne, *Fastes*, II, pp. 395–9 and 421; Thomas Bauer, "Wenilo, EB von Sens (837/837–65)," *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon* (Herzberg, 2001), XIII, pp. 754–61; and Ekkart Sauser, "Egil (Egil)," *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon* (Nordhausen, 2003), XXI, p. 351.

²⁰ Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 86–8 and 117–19; Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 201, 306, 310–14, 346 and 444; and Nelson, *Charles*, pp. 188–90 and 192.

²¹ Hincmar, *Epistola* 185, *MGH Epp.* VIII, pp. 187–90, here p. 188; Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 281–2; and Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 583–600 and 608–15.

²² Hincmar, *Epistola* 187, *MGH Epp.* VIII, p. 194: "unde scandalum possit oriri."

²³ Hincmar, *Epistola* 187, *MGH Epp.* VIII, p. 194.

²⁴ Hincmar, *Epistola* 187, *MGH Epp.* VIII, pp. 194–5.

Rule), and having gathered whatever he could for his journey he departed from Hautvillers for Rome.²⁵

Hincmar reported that Guntbert wanted to take Gottschalk's complaint to the pope, since Gottschalk had heard that Nicholas opposed the archbishop on other matters.²⁶ What Hincmar feared most, however, was that Guntbert would spread the news of Nicholas' confirmation of twin predestination, for the monk appears to have taken a copy of the annals with him. The archbishop claimed that the entry's assertion about Nicholas' view of twin predestination must be wrong, since he had "neither heard it through anyone, nor read it anywhere," and he warned Egil that since the annal entry "might now fall into the hands of many," it was necessary to inform the pope about it, "lest a scandal come from it in the church."²⁷ At the very least, Guntbert might manage to make the predestination controversy erupt again, which would undo all of Hincmar's efforts in the matter for almost two decades.

Hincmar also prepared Egil for a confrontation with Guntbert before Nicholas so that he could prove that Gottschalk must remain incarcerated. He explained the heretical nature of Gottschalk's teachings, and stressed that it was important to convince Nicholas that Gottschalk was treated fairly at Hautvillers, though he was clearly either possessed by a demon or insane, "and you know," he told Egil, "that there is usually no madness without a demon."²⁸ As if echoing his 864 letter to the pope, Hincmar closed with a final warning that should Gottschalk be allowed to leave his prison or come to a synod, then "the greatest nausea" (*maxima nausea*) would be stirred up in the church by his hidden followers.²⁹ Gottschalk was a contagious and disgusting disease that must remain quarantined lest his minions threaten the health of the entire church with a heretical insurrection.

After discovering that Guntbert had definitely fled to Italy, Hincmar sent a second letter to Egil to encourage him further.³⁰ Unfortunately no record of the pope's response to Egil's visit about Gottschalk survives, although he did send several letters over the Alps regarding the Ebbo clerics before the end of 866.³¹ Since Nicholas fell ill and died in 867, his thoughts on Gottschalk and predestination are unknown.³² Yet if Prudentius' annal account about the pope's views on predestination was accurate, Nicholas' intervention could have dramatically reopened the question of grace. Gottschalk's resistance to episcopal authority at the synods might have appeared in a new light, and even put the canonicity of his punishment in question. But instead Gottschalk stayed at Hautvillers, and the public debate on predestination remained a thing of the past.

²⁵ *La Règle*, 25, ed. de Vogüé et Neufville, p. 546.

²⁶ Hincmar, *Epistola* 187, *MGH Epp.* VIII, p. 195.

²⁷ Hincmar, *Epistola* 187, *MGH Epp.* VIII, p. 196: "... ne scandalum inde in ecclesia veniat ..."

²⁸ Hincmar, *Epistola* 187, *MGH Epp.* VIII, pp. 195–6, with the quotation on p. 196: "et scitis, quoniam mania esse non solet absque daemone."

²⁹ Hincmar, *Epistola* 187, *MGH Epp.* VIII, p. 196. For a similar discussion of heresy as nausea in the predestination debate, see: Prudentius, *De praedestinatione*, praef. and I, 7, 11 and 19, *PL* 115: 1011, 1097–8, 1161, and 1335.

³⁰ Hincmar, *Epistola* 188, *MGH Epp.* VIII, pp. 200–1.

³¹ Nicholas, *Epistolae* 79–81, *MGH Epp.* VI, pp. 414–32.

³² Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 290–1; and Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 628–34.

CORRUPTION AND BLASPHEMY IN
THE RHEIMS ANTIPHONARY

While Pope Nicholas negotiated his involvement in the controversies of the diocese of Soissons, Gottschalk sought to create a new scandal to stir up dissent against Archbishop Hincmar once more. Having obtained a copy of a Roman antiphonary being edited at Rheims under Hincmar's direction, Gottschalk claimed that it was filled with blasphemous corruptions which would endanger the souls of those using it.³³ The text contained responses for the Mass suited to the specific celebrations of the liturgical calendar. In his *Adversaria in librum responsorialem*, Gottschalk described changes made to the text as dangerous "novelties" and "blasphemies against the Holy Spirit."³⁴ In so doing, Gottschalk framed his criticism in terms of protecting the integrity of the Roman antiphonary—a work that he argued had been written by Gregory the Great through divine inspiration—from Hincmar's heretical corruptions.

How the text came to Hautvillers and into Gottschalk's hands is unclear. John the Deacon (825–80) claimed that the Roman antiphonary had been written by Gregory the Great, although the earliest surviving copies date from the second half of the ninth century.³⁵ During that time in the area from St. Denis to Corbie there was a concerted effort to copy the text, and manuscripts survive from Corbie, Compiègne, and Senlis.³⁶ Gottschalk's choice of text, however, was clearly calculated at challenging Hincmar's liturgical reforms specifically. Hincmar may have sent his text to Hautvillers to be copied, or perhaps the monks there were preparing their own version from his, and it was brought to Gottschalk for commentary by one of his supporters. His great skill as a grammarian and his profound memory for texts would have made him perhaps the most learned textual critic available at Hautvillers.

Gottschalk's criticisms of the Office of St. Remigius identify it most clearly as the Rheims antiphonary, a chief document of Hincmar's liturgical reforms of the 860s.

³³ Marie-Céline Isaïa, *Remi de Reims. Mémoire d'un saint, histoire d'une Église* (Paris, 2010), pp. 417–552, here esp. pp. 381–2, 384–5, and 452–3; François Baix, "Les sources liturgiques de la Vita Remigii de Hincmar," in *Miscellanea historica in honorem Alberti de Meyer*, 2 vols. (Louvain, 1946), I, pp. 211–27, esp. pp. 213 and 217–19; John M. Wallace-Hadrill, "History in the Mind of Archbishop Hincmar," in *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern*, ed. Ralf H.C. Davis and id. (Oxford, 1981), pp. 43–70, here 63.

³⁴ Gottschalk, *Adversaria in librum responsorialem*, CEG, pp. 427–59, which forms a portion of his second grammatical treatise. Lambot supplied the title.

³⁵ Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 357–60, here p. 358.

³⁶ *Antiphonale missarum* and *Liber responsorialis*, PL 78: 641–852, which is an edition of the texts found in the Compiègne MS; René-Jean Hesbert, *Antiphonale missarum sextuplex* (Rome, 1967), including pp. xix–xxv for a discussion of the manuscripts; Vogel, *Liturgy*, pp. 359–60; and Jacques Froger, "The Critical Edition of the Roman Gradual by the Monks of Solesmes," *Journal of the Plainsong and Medieval Music Society* 1 (1978), pp. 81–97, here 92; Michel Huglo, "Observations codicologiques sur l'antiphonaire de Compiègne (Paris, B.N.F. lat. 17436)," in *De Musica et Cantu. Studien zur Geschichte der Kirchenmusik und der Oper. Helmut Huckle zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Peter Cahn and Ann-Katrin Heimer (Hildesheim, 1993), pp. 117–30; Nathalie Henry, "The Song of Songs and the Liturgy of the *Velatio* in the Fourth Century: From Literary Metaphor to Liturgical Reality," *Studies in Church History* 35 (1999), pp. 18–28, here pp. 22–4; and Riva Jacobsson, "The Antiphoner of Compiègne: Paris, BNF lat. 17436," in *The Divine Office in the Latin Middle Ages. Methodology and Source Studies, Regional Developments, Hagiography. Written in Honor of Professor Ruth Steiner*, ed. Margot Fassler and Rebecca Baltzer (Oxford, 2000), pp. 147–78.

The ninth century witnessed a growing devotion to St. Remigius, and Hincmar was deeply involved in this process.³⁷ The tradition of St. Remigius, and correspondingly his Office in the church year, was integral with Hincmar's hopes to make his see the religious heart of Charles the Bald's realm. His hopes were fulfilled when he crowned Charles Emperor and King of Lotharingia in Metz in 869 with chrism supposedly left over from St. Remigius' baptism of Clovis, which had taken place three and a half centuries before.³⁸ Hincmar seems to have begun writing the first version of his *Vita Remigii* around the time of Charles' coronation in order to emphasize the historical importance of Rheims, and his own connection to Remigius as successor of his see.³⁹ Yet the Rheims antiphonary must have been composed prior to the coronation, since it was criticized by Gottschalk who died sometime in the late 860s.⁴⁰ Written before the dramatic events in Metz, the Office of St. Remigius was an important device for Hincmar in codifying the saint's tradition up to that time. In the end, he was successful, as Nelson explains: "Blurring the distinction between baptismal anointing and king-making . . . Hincmar announced the inauguration of a new reign that was at the same time the continuation and climax of the whole mythic history of the Franks . . . [with] Rheims as its sacred center."⁴¹ Gottschalk's response to Hincmar's ambitions was to attack the archbishop's interpretations of Remigius' role in the conversion of the Franks and their king as heretical, thereby diminishing his episcopal claims for the right to anoint his king as emperor.

The passage from the office, which drew Gottschalk's censure, dealt with Remigius and the baptism of the Merovingian King Clovis and the Franks.⁴²

After taking the holy chrism from heaven, the blessed Remigius sanctified in the waters the renowned nation of the Franks together with their noble king, and enriched them fully with the gift of the Holy Spirit. He appeared as a dove with the gift of singular grace and supplied the divine chrism from heaven to the pontiff.⁴³

³⁷ Isaïa, *Remi de Reims*, pp. 418–64; and Philippe Depreux, "Imbuendis ad fidem prefulgidum surrexit lumen gentibus: La dévotion à saint Remi de Reims aux IX^e et X^e siècle," *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 35 (1992), pp. 111–29.

³⁸ *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 869, ed. Grat et al., pp. 153–62; Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 455 and 703–5; and Nelson, *Charles*, pp. 219–20. On Clovis' baptism, see: Leon Levillain, "La conversion et le baptême de Clovis," *Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France* 21 (1935), pp. 161–92; Knut Schäferdieck, "Remigius von Reims, Kirchenmann einer Unbruchzeit," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 94 (1983), pp. 256–78; Mark Spencer, "Dating the Baptism of Clovis, 1886–1993," *EME* 3 (1994), pp. 97–116; Joseph-Claude Poulin, "Geneviève, Clovis et Remi: entre politique et religion," in *Clovis—histoire et mémoire. Le baptême de Clovis, l'événement: Actes du Colloque international d'histoire de Reims*, ed. Michel Rouche (Paris, 1997), pp. 331–48; and Danuta Shanzer, "Dating the Baptism of Clovis: the Bishop of Vienne vs the Bishop of Tours," *EME* 7 (1998), pp. 28–57.

³⁹ Hincmar, *Vita Remigii*, ed. Bruno Krusch, *MGH SSRM I* (Hanover, 1896), pp. 239–341. On the dating, see Isaïa, *Remi de Reims*, pp. 417–64; and Devisse, *Hincmar*, pp. 1004–54.

⁴⁰ Isaïa, *Remi de Reims*, pp. 384–5 and 452–3.

⁴¹ Nelson, *Charles*, p. 220, and Hen, *The Royal Patronage*, pp. 136–8.

⁴² Gottschalk, *Adversaria*, *CEG*, p. 455. For a discussion of his more minor criticisms of the Office, see Baix, "Les sources," pp. 214–22.

⁴³ Baix cited the passage in question from a later manuscript of the antiphonary; see: Baix, "Les sources," p. 218: "Gentem Francorum inclutam simul cum rege nobili beatus Remigius sumpto caelitus crismate sacro sanctificavit gurgite atque spiritus sancti plene ditavit munere. Qui dono

Gottschalk's criticism of the antiphon accorded with his earlier attacks on his opponents' doctrines: he condemned how it transferred the salvific power of grace from the Holy Spirit to the saint, denying the power of the God in favor of the saint. In other words, the heresy was located in limiting grace in favor of human action. Gottschalk marshaled biblical and patristic evidence to show that God and *not* Remigius had the power to baptize and sanctify:

[The saint] neither took up the "chrism from heaven" nor did he "sanctify," because it is the Lord who baptizes as the Lord himself said to the blessed John: "He who sanctifies and those who are sanctified are all from one" [Jo 1, 33] as the apostle Paul affirms [Heb 2, 11]. For it is very great for the saints to be sanctified, [but] to sanctify is clearly above their powers, and thus it is of the Holy Spirit to give to whomever he wishes to anoint much more to enrich a people fully. The Lord Jesus Christ, the son of God, who sanctifies and his elect who are all sanctified from one God the Father . . . Likewise: "It is God who justifies" [Rom 8, 33]. Likewise: "May God be just and justifying" [Rom 3, 26]. About which when a certain grammarian named Audax called Saint Augustine "sanctifier of the people of the Lord," he wrote: "Why do you call me the sanctifier of the people of God? I beg your pardon, but you do not at all know to whom you speak, for whom it is great to be made holy." Here also another doctor said that the elect of God know to accept the grace of the Holy Spirit, they do not know how to give it. He should not have said in any way that the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove gave the chrism to Saint Remigius, who just gave the remains from the chrism to King Clovis himself. It is God who sanctifies, but the needy, weak saint asks from him that he and the rest be sanctified. He alone "enriches the pauper" [I Sam 2, 7] who nonetheless begs with abject humility to be enriched. He presumes much who "corrected" such things in this corrupted book of God.⁴⁴

Gottschalk drew on several biblical passages here to remind the reader that God—not saints—sanctified souls. He gave an example from one of Augustine's epistles where he had refused to be addressed as a "sanctifier" by a contemporary to show that the illustrious church father had scorned such a title, making the contrast between Hincmar and Augustine clear.⁴⁵ As in his predestination writings Gottschalk

singularis gratiae in columba apparuit et divinum crisma caelitus pontifici ministravit." Regarding the antiphonary manuscripts (Reims BM 316 and Paris B.N.F. Lat. 17991) related to passages cited by Gottschalk, see Isaïa, *Remi de Reims*, pp. 380–5.

⁴⁴ Gottschalk, *Adversaria*, CEG, pp. 455–6: "Nec caelitus crisma sumpsit nec ipse sanctificavit quia dominus est qui baptizat ut ipse deus beato Iohanni dixit, et: Qui sanctificat et qui sanctificantur ex uno omnes ut Paulus apostolus adfirmat. Nam sanctis permagnum est sanctificari, sanctificare plane supra vires est, sic et spiritus sancti munere quemlibet inrorare nedum plene gentem ditare. Dominus Iesus Christus dei filius qui sanctificat et eius electi qui sanctificantur ex uno deo patre omnes . . . Item: Deus qui iustificat. Item: Ut sit ipse deus iustus est iustificans. Unde sanctus Augustinus cum eum quidam grammaticus, Audax nomine, sacratorem plebis domini nominasset: Quid inquit me sacratorem plebis dei vocas? Da veniam. Multum cui loquaris ignoras cui sacratum esse magnum est. Hinc etiam alius doctor ait quod electi dei gratiam sancti spiritus accipere sciunt, dare nesciunt. Non debuit dicere ullatenus sancto Remegio in columbae specie crisma ministrasse spiritum sanctum qui etiam velut de crismate ipso reliquias dedit regi Hludowwico. Deus est qui sanctificat, sanctus vero quilibet egenus inops ab ipso sanctificari se ceterosque supplicat. Solus ille pauperem ditat qui tamen ab ipso ditari prona humilitate mendicant. Multum praesumpsit qui talia in hoc corrupto dei libro correxerit."

⁴⁵ Augustine, *Epistula* 261, 2; *PL* 33: 1076. The "alius doctor" was the Pseudo-Hieronymian *De septem ordinibus ecclesiae*, ed. Athanasius Kalff (Bonn, 1935), p. 46. On this text, see: Roger

was concerned foremost to show that God was always the active agent in salvation, while the elect were the grateful, praying recipients of grace. In Gottschalk's eyes, therefore, Hincmar's description of Remigius was as heretical as his predestination teachings, for he credited a human being's actions rather than God's in saving souls.

Central to Gottschalk's attacks on Hincmar's antiphony was his view that the "Gregorian" Roman liturgical tradition was divinely inspired, which implied that any change made to the text would introduce "novelty" and, therefore, error to the text. Gottschalk wrote that the Holy Spirit had dictated the text of the Roman antiphony to Pope Gregory, and therefore it must in no way be changed: "for the apostle orders us absolutely to avoid the novelties of voices" [I Tim 6, 20].⁴⁶ This passage from Paul's letter stated that his reader should avoid the "profane novelties of voices and disputations in the false name of knowledge, which certain people utter when making promises about the faith."⁴⁷ Patristic authors—in particular Augustine, as well as others like Vincent of Lérins and Gregory the Great—used the expression "novelties of voices" to describe the views of heretics.⁴⁸ Carolingian authors used the expression in the same way: it appears in Alcuin's anti-Adoptionist writings and the *Opus Caroli regis* during Charlemagne's reign,⁴⁹ and in the writings of Hrabanus and especially Florus of Lyons, the latter using it to condemn both the liturgist, Amalarius of Metz, and Eriugena.⁵⁰ Gottschalk's opponents also used the expression with reference to him: Amolo warned him to avoid the "novelties of voices,"⁵¹ and Hincmar argued on several occasions that Gottschalk's and his allies' teachings displayed a love of "novelties of voices."⁵²

Reynolds, "The Pseudo-Hieronymian *De septem ordinibus ecclesiae*: Notes on Its Origins, Abridgments and Use in Early Medieval Canonical Collections," *Revue bénédictine* 80 (1970), pp. 238–52.

⁴⁶ Gottschalk, *Opusculum primum*, *CEG*, p. 380 and p. 381: "... nam magnopere nobis apostolus iubet vitare novitates vocum."

⁴⁷ I Tim 6, 20–1: "[20] devitans profanas vocum novitates et oppositiones falsi nominis scientiae [21] quam quidam promittentes circa fidem exciderunt."

⁴⁸ Augustine, *Epistola* 193, 1, *PL* 33: 870; id., *In Iohannis evangelium*, 97, 4, ed. Willems, p. 575; id., *Sermo* 299, *PL* 38: 1376, here writing against the Pelagians; id., *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum*, 8, *PL* 44: 547–638, here 623, here writing against the Pelagians; id., *Contra Julianum*, 10, *PL* 44: 637–874, here 700–2, writing against the Pelagians; Celestine I, *Epistola* 13. *Ad Nestorium*, *PL* 50: 473; Vincent of Lérins, *Duo commonitoria*, I, 21–2 and 24, *PL* 50: 637–86, here 666–7 and 670, writing against heretics; Fulgentius of Ruspe, *Epistola* 12, 3, 8, ed. Jean Fraipont, *CCSL* 91 (Turnhout, 1968), pp. 362–81, here pp. 366–7; and Gregory, *Moralia*, XVIII, 26, ed. Adriaen, pp. 910–11, writing about heretics.

⁴⁹ *Opus Caroli regis*, praefatio, II, 24; III, 12; IV, praef. and 28, ed. Freeman, pp. 282, 352, 359, 379, and 486; Alcuin, *Contra Felicem*, I, 2 and VI, 1 *PL* 101: 129 and 199; and id., *Epistola ad Elipandum*, *PL* 101: 240–2.

⁵⁰ Hrabanus Maurus, *Commentariorum in Ecclesiasticum*, II, 2, *PL* 109: 796, writing about false prophets; id., *Enarrationes in epistolas beati Pauli*, XXIII, 2 and XXIV, 6, *PL* 112: 635–6, citing Gregory on heretics, and 645; Florus of Lyons, *Invectio canonica* and *Relatio de eventibus synodi Carisacensis*, ed. Zechiel-Eckes, *CCCM* 260 (Turnhout, 2014), pp. 15 and 89; and Florus, *Libellus*, ed. Zechiel-Eckes, pp. 94 and 163.

⁵¹ Amolo, *Epistola ad Gothescalum*, *PL* 116: 86.

⁵² Hincmar, *Liber*, *PL* 125: 296; and id., *De una*, praef. and 1, 2, 10, and 16, *PL* 125: 474–6, 494, 528, 554, 585, and 588.

In this tradition, Gottschalk defined Hincmar's changes to Gregory's divinely inspired antiphony as heretical corruptions. There was nothing unusual about Gottschalk's concern for an allegedly corrupted liturgical text: Carolingian worries about bringing down divine wrath for praying from writings filled with errors date from Charlemagne's *Admonitio generalis* of 789.⁵³ Amalarius of Metz's liturgical innovations had been severely attacked as heretical in the 830s by Agobard and Florus, and they were signally condemned at the Synod of Quierzy in 838.⁵⁴ Gottschalk recommended corrections to protect the clarity and sacred integrity of the antiphony and even suggested additional minor amendments, explaining that "that which is clearer is better in song" or that his recommendation "has the full sense which agrees with the whole antiphon."⁵⁵ Gottschalk argued that even slight corruptions, which distorted the meaning of whole antiphons, must be corrected, warning that "the tradition of Roman antiphony should in no way have been changed."⁵⁶

According to Gottschalk, the consequences of even seemingly insignificant changes were grave. Such sensitivity should come as no surprise when considering the sweeping project of Carolingian liturgical reform during the eighth and ninth centuries which focused as much on the orthodoxy of liturgical texts as on the artistry of its performance.⁵⁷ Regarding an antiphon for the *Responsoria de beato Job*, which reads "In all these things Job did not sin with his lips, and did not say anything foolish against God," Gottschalk noted that the phrase "anything foolish" had been changed to "something foolish," that is from "stultum quid" to "stultum aliquid." He warned his reader that this seemingly insignificant change had terrible repercussions. Playing with the wording of the passage, he wrote that the person who made the change was a "fool" (*stultus*) for corrupting it "on account of vanity" (*ob vanitatum*), since he insulted the Holy Spirit with novelties by violating the divinely-inspired words.⁵⁸ Vanity was a matter of pride—a sin traditionally associated with heretics—and Gottschalk condemned such vain changes as grave sins that desecrated the very prayers which God had granted the faithful through his servant Gregory.⁵⁹

Yet Gottschalk located what he thought were even more heinous corruptions in the text, which, like the Office of St. Remigius, contradicted the almighty power of God. Regarding an antiphon related to the Feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross (September 14), Gottschalk condemned the corrector's use of the verb *lavare* in place of *lavere* in the passage "Crux benedicta nitet, dominus . . . vulnera nostra

⁵³ *Die Admonitio generalis*, 70–2, ed. Mordek, pp. 222–7.

⁵⁴ Ganz, "Theology," pp. 777–8; and Zechiel-Eckes, *Florus*, pp. 21–71.

⁵⁵ Gottschalk, *Adversaria*, *CEG*, pp. 428: "est in melo melius eo quod est apertius," and 429: "habet plenum sensum omni antiphonae congruum."

⁵⁶ Gottschalk, *Adversaria*, *CEG*, pp. 429, 430, 446, 452, and 453: "minime mutari debuit traditio romani antiphonarii."

⁵⁷ Hen, *The Royal Patronage of the Liturgy*; and Éric Palazzo, "The Performance of the Liturgy," in *The Cambridge History of Christianity: Early Medieval Christianities, c.600–c.1100*, eds. Thomas Noble and Julia Smith (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 472–90 and 766–8.

⁵⁸ *Liber responsalis*, PL 78: 834; and Gottschalk, *Adversaria*, *CEG*, p. 452.

⁵⁹ For other examples, see: Gottschalk, *Adversaria*, *CEG*, pp. 447 and 453.

lavat.”⁶⁰ He argued that with the verb “lavat” instead of “lavit,” the text meant, “the blessed cross glistens, the Lord . . . moistens our wounds,” whereas it should read that it “washes away” or “cleanses” them. Gottschalk explained that “lavat” meant “moisten” (*humectat*) but “lavit” could mean either “moisten” or “wash away” (*abluit*).⁶¹ Both verbs, “lavat” and “lavit,” were used alternately in manuscripts of Venantius Fortunatus’ sixth-century poem, *De cruce domini*, which served as the source of the passage.⁶² Nevertheless, according to Gottschalk’s interpretation, the corrupted text denied the power of Christ, making this passage as heretical as the Office of St. Remigius.

While the distinction Gottschalk made between “lavat” and “lavit” does not appear to have been a common one,⁶³ he nonetheless seems to have been correct about which verb was generally used in the passage in the ninth-century liturgical texts, for the line appears with “lavit” in the “Gregorian” *Liber responsalis* and in Alcuin’s *Expositio in psalmos graduales*.⁶⁴ Gottschalk severely condemned this minor change, saying: “we ought not to falsify, corrupt, violate, cut off, or mutilate the integrity of the sense on account of one syllable,” and this was especially true regarding the day of Christ’s passion.⁶⁵ As in the case of the passage about Job, Gottschalk emphasized the severity of the corruption: “He acts wickedly indeed, who on account of one syllable insults the Holy Spirit.”⁶⁶

The expression to insult the Holy Spirit was occasionally used by patristic authors to describe heretics’ opinions as attacks on God: Jerome, in a letter to Marcellus, wrote that his heretical opponents were insulting the Holy Spirit,⁶⁷ and Augustine made this accusation against the Arians.⁶⁸ In his letter, Jerome explained that the expression was an alternate way of saying “blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.”⁶⁹ To blaspheme was to show contempt for God in speech or action. Yet this particular figure of speech originated in the Synoptic Gospels, where it is recorded

⁶⁰ *Liber responsalis*, PL 78: 803; and Gottschalk, *Adversaria*, CEG, p. 439.

⁶¹ Gottschalk, *Adversaria*, CEG, p. 439.

⁶² Venantius Fortunatus, *De cruce domini*, ed. Friedrich Leo, MGH Auctores Antiquissimi IV (Berlin, 1881), p. 27.

⁶³ Gottschalk’s distinction between *lavare* and *lavere* appears to have been his own. See, for example: *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, ed. P.G.W. Glare (Oxford, 1968–82), pp. 1009–10; and *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (Leipzig, 1970–9), VII, pp. 1047–55.

⁶⁴ *Liber responsalis*, PL 78: 803; and Alcuin, *Officia per ferias*, PL 101: 509–612, here 563.

⁶⁵ Gottschalk, *Adversaria*, CEG, pp. 439–40: “Propter enim unam syllabam non debemus interpolare corrumpere violare detruncare sive mutilare sensus integritatem.”

⁶⁶ Gottschalk, *Adversaria*, CEG, p. 440: “Male siquidem facit qui propter unam syllabam spiritui sancto facit iniuriam.”

⁶⁷ Jerome, *Epistola* 42. *Ad Marcellam*, PL 22: 477.

⁶⁸ Augustine, *De symbolo sermo ad catechumenos*, 4, PL 40: 637–52, here 642–3.

⁶⁹ Note the parallels: Jerome, *Epistola* 42, PL 22: 477: “Ut autem et acutius aliquid interrogemus, respondeat, quid sit contra Filium hominis dicere, et in Spiritum Sanctum blasphemare. Ego quippe assero iuxta sensum illius, eos qui Christum in persecutione negaverint, contra Filium hominis dixisse, et non in Spiritum Sanctum blasphemasse. Qui enim interrogatur, an Christianus sit, et Christianum se non esse responderit; utique negando Christum, hoc est, Filium hominis, Spiritui Sancto non facit injuriam. Si autem Christum negando, negavit et Spiritum; edisserat Haereticus, quomodo non peccet in Spiritum, qui Filium hominis denegaverit.”

that Christ said that such a sin would not be forgiven: “And everyone who says a word against the Son of Man, it will be forgiven him, but it will not be forgiven him, who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit.”⁷⁰ In the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, the context of this passage was when the Pharisees claimed that Christ was only able to cast out demons because he was Beelzebub, the prince of demons.⁷¹ In Luke’s Gospel, this passage appears when Christ told his hearers that confessing him was important: he would deny anyone who denied him, and when they were dragged before the synagogues, authorities, and rulers they should not worry what they would say, for the Holy Spirit would instruct them.⁷²

In order to understand Gottschalk’s criticisms of Hincmar’s corrections to the antiphony, it is important to consider the significance of the phrase “blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.” There is surprisingly little scholarship on blasphemy in medieval Europe, a topic which historians tend to distinguish from heresy as a relatively unpunished crime.⁷³ Scholars have focused especially on legal texts dealing with blasphemy, which are rare in the early medieval period, and what sources do exist suggest little public concern. Among the few instances dealing with blasphemy as a legal issue in the Carolingian period are a few capitularies from Charlemagne’s era: the *Capitulare missorum generale* commanded bishops and priests to avoid blasphemy, as well as disputes and lawsuits;⁷⁴ and another was concerned that individuals should avoid blaspheming in their oaths in law courts.⁷⁵ The legislative focus of previous scholarship, however, leaves out the very important issues of doctrine and orthodoxy. In 798 Pope Leo declared that the writings of the “Adoptionist heretic,” Felix of Urgel, were heresy and blasphemy, equating the very two categories that historians of blasphemy have sought to distinguish.⁷⁶ With this in mind, let us consider what theologians wrote about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit in order to understand how this sin was interpreted and what relationship it had to accusations of heresy.

We have already seen that patristic commentators associated the sin of “insulting the Holy Spirit,” which Jerome equated with “blasphemy against the Holy Spirit,” with heresy. In particular, it was often regarded as the act of denying the divinity of Christ—a sin, it was claimed, frequently committed by heretics. For example, Hilary noted when commenting on Matthew’s Gospel that failing to recognize Christ’s divinity was the unforgivable sin of both the Jews and the Arians.⁷⁷

⁷⁰ Lc 12, 10–11: “Et omnis qui dicit verbum in filium hominis remittetur illi [11] ei autem qui in spiritum sanctum blasphemaverit non remittetur.” Compare Mt 12, 32 and Mc 3, 29. Special thanks to Shelly Matthews for this citation.

⁷¹ Mt 12, 22–32 and Mc 3, 19–30.

⁷² Lc 12, 8–12. In Luke, the passage about Christ and Beelzebub appears in Lc 11, 14–27.

⁷³ Leonard Levy, *Treason Against God: A History of the Offense of Blasphemy* (New York, 1981); David Lawton, *Blasphemy* (Philadelphia, 1993), pp. 43–83; Leonard Levy, *Blasphemy* (New York, 1993), pp. 46–51; and David Nash, *Blasphemy in the Christian World* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 42–8. For the Spanish context, see: Janina Safran, “Identity and Differentiation in Ninth-Century al-Andalus,” *Speculum* 76 (2001), pp. 573–98.

⁷⁴ *MGH Cap.* I, No. 33 [802], 35, pp. 91–9, here 98.

⁷⁵ *MGH Cap.* I, No. 44, 8, pp. 122–6, here 123–4.

⁷⁶ *MGH Conc.* I, No. 23 [Rome, 798], pp. 203–4, here 203 and 204.

⁷⁷ Hilary, *Commentarius in evangelium Matthaei*, 12, 17–18, *PL* 9: 917–1078, here 989.

In his discussion of Matthew, Jerome wrote that heretics and schismatics often misunderstood what was at stake when committing the unpardonable sin of denying Christ, and he emphasized that such a sin was an act of jealousy (*invidia*) akin to the devil's works.⁷⁸

The most extensive patristic treatment of the Gospel passage dealing with blasphemy against the Holy Spirit was Augustine's *Sermo* 71, a work cited by Gottschalk in his *De diversis* and *Opusculum secundum*.⁷⁹ In this text, the church father gave a two-fold interpretation of this passage: the first related to "enemies of Christ" and the second to orthodox Christians. Regarding the former, Augustine wrote that the denial of Christ's divinity was a sin of Jews, pagans, and many heretics.⁸⁰ The sin demonstrated the pride of those refusing to acknowledge Christ's power. Yet the church father also recognized the possibility of great pride among orthodox Christians. He wrote that their truly unforgivable blasphemy against the Holy Spirit was to be unrepentant, for then they could not be forgiven in the church which was the only place to receive the forgiveness offered by the Trinity through grace.⁸¹ In doing so, they denied the role of grace in salvation. For Augustine, the Gospel passage condemned two sins of pride: the heretics' crime of denying Christ's divinity and the orthodox Christians' refusal to be humble and contrite within the church. Each sin was terrible and would lead to damnation.

Eighth and ninth century theologians adopted these patristic interpretations of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit as a deadly manifestation of pride. Bede transmitted them in his commentaries on Mark and Luke to Carolingian authors like Hrabanus, Paschasius, and Hincmar. Working from Jerome's interpretation in his discussion of Mark, Bede noted that the denial of Christ in the Gospel passage was unforgivable, because the blasphemer—like the Devil and his demonic angels—attacked the "majesty of the deity" (*majestas deitatis*) against his better judgment.⁸² Such an attack suggested that the sinner denied divine power as a rebel against God. Hrabanus followed this particular interpretation from Bede in his Matthew Commentary.⁸³ In his examination of Luke, however, Bede drew from Augustine's interpretation to emphasize that a blasphemer was unforgiven because he rejected repentance with a hard heart.⁸⁴ His pride prevented him from acknowledging God's power, and therefore he could not be absolved of his sins. Paschasius Radbertus adopted this reading in his study of Matthew,⁸⁵ as did Hincmar when writing about Gottschalk's pride as a heretic in his *Liber de praedestinatione*.⁸⁶

Gottschalk's condemnations of the corruptions in the antiphonary as blasphemies against the Holy Spirit were accusations about the corrector's or, in his opinion,

⁷⁸ Jerome, *Commentariorum in Matheum*, II, lines 488–508, ed. Hurst and Adriaen, pp. 94–5.

⁷⁹ Augustine, *Sermo* 71, *PL* 38: 446–67; and Gottschalk, *De diversis*, *CEG*, p. 310; and id., *Opusculum secundum*, *CEG*, p. 462.

⁸⁰ Augustine, *Sermo* 71, 3, *PL* 38: 447–8.

⁸¹ Augustine, *Sermo* 71, 12–24, *PL* 38: 453–67.

⁸² Bede, *In Marci evangelium expositio*, I, 3, ed. Hurst, pp. 476–7.

⁸³ Hrabanus, *Expositio in Matthaeum*, IV, 12, 31, ed. Löfstedt, pp. 360–1.

⁸⁴ Bede, *In Lucae evangelium expositio*, IV, 12, ed. Hurst, pp. 248–50.

⁸⁵ Paschasius, *Expositio*, VI, 12, 31–2, ed. Paulus, pp. 670–5.

⁸⁶ Hincmar, *Liber*, *PL* 125: 217–18.

the corruptor's unrepentant pride and heresy. "Corrections" made out of vanity, such as the switch from "quid" to "aliquid" in the antiphon on Job, as well as numerous other minor corruptions which altered the meaning of whole responses and inserted novelties into the text, damaged the sacred integrity of Gregory's divinely inspired antiphonary. Gottschalk believed that the display of pride involved in such corruptions amounted to unrepentant scorn for God's almighty power, an unforgivable and therefore mortal sin. Especially dangerous were the heretical statements denying Christ's salvific power and the role of grace in sanctification in the Offices of St. Remigius and the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, which made the text in Gottschalk's eyes as heretical as Hincmar's teachings on predestination. These sinful, heretical corruptions made the Rheims antiphonary unusable as it was, since it would endanger the souls of any monks singing its prayers, and Gottschalk gave careful instructions on how it must be amended.

Part of the context for understanding Gottschalk's criticisms of the antiphonary at Hautvillers is his composition there of the *Horologium*, a series of eight devotional hymns for the monastic hours with a prose introduction contained in the manuscript Bern 584.⁸⁷ Josef Szövérfy suggested Gottschalk's sequence was the first to be composed for an individual, presumably since he composed them to sing alone in his cell.⁸⁸ Yet Marie-Louise Weber argues instead that the sequence could be sung collectively, noting especially the use of the plural "nos" rather than the singular "ego" throughout the hymns.⁸⁹ While Gottschalk could certainly have sung the hymns privately, Weber's point implies that Gottschalk may have created the sequence as an alternative liturgy for his supporters within Hautvillers.

This alternative liturgy could have had the effect of making his Hautvillers supporters feel a sense of solidarity and safety in the face of Hincmar's liturgical reforms. In commenting on the hymns, Weber notes how they correspond to traditional monastic themes of the singers' joy of light and terror of darkness in both the earthly and spiritual senses, as well as Gottschalk's particular concerns for the humble confession of utter human sinfulness, signs of grace that bring hope, and the lovable but terrifying glory of the Trinitarian God.⁹⁰ In this way, Gottschalk cast those singing his hymns as God's faithful followers surrounded by sinister forces in a troubled, fallen world, but still helped by their deity. While neither heresy nor Hincmar are mentioned explicitly, the imagery works to portray the singers as safe and protected from the spiritual darkness thanks to divine aid. In this sense, Gottschalk could place those spiritual dangers very much outside Hautvillers, where Hincmar's heretical tyranny dominated and plagued the archdiocese.

Whether Gottschalk was successful at stirring up controversy over the antiphonary may never be known. Since the Rheims antiphonary survived in a twelfth-century manuscript with the corruptions intact, Gottschalk's corrections did not apparently challenge Hincmar's version of the text at Rheims.⁹¹ Yet Gottschalk's commentary could have made the brothers at Hautvillers or in other locations less

⁸⁷ Gottschalk, *Horologium*, PLAC VI, pp. 97–104; and Weber, *Die Gedichte*, pp. 175–85.

⁸⁸ Szövérfy, *Die Annalen*, p. 238.

⁸⁹ Weber, *Die Gedichte*, p. 299.

⁹⁰ Weber, *Die Gedichte*, pp. 297–332.

⁹¹ Baix, "Les sources," pp. 213 and 217–19.

willing to adopt offices out of the archbishop's text. The other surviving antiphonaries do not contain the Office to St. Remigius, and some of Gottschalk's criticisms of particular passages accord with other ninth-century texts. Whether this was due to Gottschalk's commentary or not is, of course, unclear. What is of particular importance about Gottschalk's criticisms, however, is that they show his efforts to sabotage Hincmar's liturgical reforms by discrediting them as heretical at the crucial moment when the archbishop was trying to raise the see's profile in the 860s. As in the 850s, Gottschalk sought to create controversy in order to defy Hincmar's power publicly and to protect the elect from heresy.

GOTTSCHALK'S END

When Gottschalk died after a period of illness at Hautvillers on October 30, sometime in the late 860s,⁹² he used the occasion for his last act of defiance against Hincmar. On discovering that Gottschalk was on his deathbed, the archbishop sent one final request for Gottschalk to abandon his doctrines in exchange for lifting the state of excommunication. Gottschalk scorned Hincmar's offer, and then penned a final confessional text, where he described himself one last time as God's suffering but faithful servant, who deserved the divine grace necessary for eternal salvation on account of his unwavering loyalty and humility before God. After his death, Gottschalk's memory was recorded in the monastery's *necrologium* and he received the monks' prayers on the anniversary of his death. Gottschalk's last act of defiance and the fact that his memory was honored at Hautvillers reveal the limits of Hincmar's control over his enemy and the monastery long after the main controversies of the 850s had ended.

Hincmar's version of Gottschalk's death appeared in an appendix to his *De una*, written probably some years after the main part of the work. He recorded there that he sent the monks of Hautvillers a confession of faith regarding predestination and the Trinity for Gottschalk, which he disparaged and refused to sign.⁹³ The archbishop instructed them to encourage him to sign it in return for the earthly

⁹² The evidence for the date appears in the Hautvillers *necrologium*. See LeMaitre, *Répertoire*, II, no. 1687, pp. 726–7, referring to Mabillon's notes in Paris B.N.F. MS Lat. 11902, where the name "Godescalcus" appears on fol. 5r under III. kal. November (October 30); Mabillon, *Annales*, vol. III, XXXVI, 42, p. 125; and *Gallia Christiana*, IX, p. 423. Manceaux, *Histoire*, p. 253, citing Antonio de Yepes, *Chroniques générales de l'ordre de Saint-Benoît*, trans. Martin Rethelois, II (Toul, 1684), p. 387, accepted as a genuine ninth-century text the sympathetic epitaph written for Gottschalk in a seventeenth-century martyrology. Yet Mabillon, *Annales*, vol. III, XXXVI, 42, p. 125 described this martyrology as "novum" and written by a "recentissimus auctor" in connection with contemporary theological debates; and *Gallia Christiana*, IX, p. 423 indicated that "recentiores" had written the epitaph. While Schrörs, *Hincmar*, pp. 160–1 suggested 868–9 for Gottschalk's death and Vielhaber, *Gottschalk*, p. 28 left it at sometime during the late 860s, Aegerter, "Gottschalk," p. 212, Devisse, *Hincmar*, p. 186, Boller, *Gottschalk*, p. 54, note 120, and Gillis, "Heresy in the Flesh," pp. 261–2 followed Manceaux. I am grateful to Reader C's questions on this point which gave me the opportunity to correct the mistake.

⁹³ Hincmar, *De una*, PL 125: 616. See also Tavard, *Trina*, pp. 126–8.

comforts of the monastery, the Eucharist, and a proper burial among the other brothers “with psalms and hymns” (*cum psalmis et hymnis*).⁹⁴ Hincmar noted, however, that Gottschalk refused to abandon his “thought and doctrine” (*sensus et doctrina*) even to receive Communion, and then “finished his shameful life with a fitting death.”⁹⁵

Hincmar’s account was little more than a condemnation, serving to confirm what he had written about Gottschalk all along: he was a perverted, irredeemable heretic to the very end. Yet Hincmar also revealed that his enemy’s uncanny ability to transform every encounter with the archbishop into an opportunity to defy his episcopal authority and to persuade others to join his cause remained with Gottschalk up to his death. The effect of Gottschalk’s defiance on the community of Hautvillers should not be underestimated. His name was found in the monastery’s *necrologium* under October 30, which indicates that the monks would pray for his soul on the anniversary of his death like they would for other deceased members of their community.⁹⁶ Schrörs suggested that the Gottschalk listed in the *necrologium* must have been someone else with the same name, but the support he received at Hautvillers for two decades suggests otherwise.⁹⁷ The brothers at Hautvillers honored Gottschalk without fear of reprisal from Hincmar, although they were powerless to overturn Gottschalk’s canonical sentence. The fact that Rothad, another of Hincmar’s enemies, was their bishop must have given the monks greater latitude in their treatment of Gottschalk, since Rothad could act as a buffer between themselves and the archbishop.

In these circumstances, Gottschalk composed his last confessional text in his so-called *De diversis* from Bern Bürgerbibliothek 584.⁹⁸ This work is a collection of Gottschalk’s last thoughts, teachings, and advice for his supporters on doctrinal and spiritual matters: the first half contains a series of theological arguments focusing on Christ’s nature, the incarnation, and the issue of predestination,⁹⁹ while the second includes a number of prayers characteristic of his style.¹⁰⁰ The text reveals that Gottschalk’s chief concern for himself and his readers in the last days of his life was correct doctrine, humility, prayer, and the possibility of spiritual transformation through grace—themes common to his earlier writings. Yet *De diversis* also contained Gottschalk’s closing and final prayer, in which he sought out protection from his enemies, forgiveness for his sins, and eternal life.¹⁰¹

De diversis can be dated to the late 860s based on an aside that Gottschalk recorded in it regarding the Synod of Soissons in 853. While explaining that

⁹⁴ Hincmar, *De una*, PL 125: 618.

⁹⁵ Hincmar, *De una*, PL 125: 618: “. . . sicque indignam vitam digna morte finivit.”

⁹⁶ LeMaitre, *Répertoire*, II, no. 1687, pp. 726–7, referring to Mabillon’s notes in Paris B.N.F. MS Lat. 11902, where the name “Godescalkus” appears on fol. 5r under III. kal. November (October 30); Mabillon, *Annales*, vol. III, XXXVI, 42, p. 125; and *Gallia Christiana*, IX, p. 423.

⁹⁷ Schrörs, *Hincmar*, p. 161, note 54.

⁹⁸ Gottschalk, *De diversis*, *CEG*, pp. 294–324. In the codex the text falls between the *Quaestiones de anima* and *De corpore et sanguine domini*.

⁹⁹ Gottschalk, *De diversis*, *CEG*, pp. 294–318.

¹⁰⁰ Gottschalk, *De diversis*, *CEG*, pp. 318–24.

¹⁰¹ Gottschalk, *De diversis*, *CEG*, pp. 320–4.

Sabellian heretics did not differentiate between the three persons of the Trinity, Gottschalk remarked how that heresy had resurfaced sixteen years before at a synod when “‘Faustus’—the Manichee from Rheims—publicly ranted before the king and people that the Holy Spirit has blood within it.”¹⁰² “Faustus” was an Augustinian reference to the “bishop of the Manichees” (*episcopus manichorum*) in the *Confessiones*,¹⁰³ a cognomen that Gottschalk used to refer to Hincmar.¹⁰⁴ Gottschalk had accused Hincmar of Sabellianism during the *trina deitas* controversy, which seems to be his first recorded mention of the heresy, and the synod in question was most likely the Synod of Soissons, where the controversy had begun. Since the synod took place in April, 853¹⁰⁵ and Gottschalk died on October 30 probably in 868 or 869, it seems most likely that he was referring to that event.

Let us now turn to Gottschalk’s final prayer to see how he described himself at the very end of his life. His purpose was straightforward in that he pleaded for grace and salvation. At first he used approaches familiar from his earlier prayers: appeals for transformation through divine grace, expressions of grief for his past sins, and acknowledgement of Christ as the only way to salvation.¹⁰⁶ Yet he then employed a new tactic—he sought to *compel* God to grant him grace by recalling his utter humbleness and absolute dependency on Christ. In other words, by claiming true humility he made a case as he neared his death that he was one of the elect and deserved grace. Of course, he had to beg for grace from the omnipotent God, since there was no other way, but he made a forceful argument that he deserved it nonetheless:

But because “I,” wretched and unhappy, “took refuge with you” [Ps 142, 9]—most correct way, most pious life—through you and with you leading me, drawing me, bearing me—I entreat you (inclined with humility of heart and body, however much I am able), my most pious Lord God—always to be adored, worshipped and feared—look upon me according to your manifold mercies. I believe indeed most firmly and I know most certainly, thanks to you God, that “if you”—Lord, redeemer and savior of the world—“wish, you can save me” [Mt 8, 2] and free me from all of my sins and enemies in every way. Therefore I worship you—my most merciful saving Lord God—with my whole heart beseeching and saying: “You are my refuge from the tribulation which surrounded me, rescue me, my exultation, from those surrounding me” [Ps 31, 7]. I ask also for myself, most deceitful and indeed entirely unworthy of you in all things, that you look upon me (ever most needy), and freely respond and clemently say: “I will give you understanding and I will prepare you on this path on which you will go, I will fix my eyes over you. Amen.” [Ps 31, 8]. “Blessing and brightness and wisdom and acts of thanks and honor and virtue and strength to our God for ever and ever. Amen” [Apoc 7, 12].¹⁰⁷

¹⁰² Gottschalk, *De diversis*, *CEG*, p. 298: “. . . sicuti scilicet iam sunt anni xvi quod Remis latravit Faustus manichaeus publice praesente rege et plebe spiritum sanctum sanguinem penitus habere . . .”

¹⁰³ Augustine, *Confessiones*, V, 3, 6, 7, and 13; VI, 11 ed. Skutella, pp. 78, 83, 86, 96, and 116–17.

¹⁰⁴ *CEG*, p. 298, note for line 18.

¹⁰⁵ *MGH Conc.* III, No. 27 [Soissons, 853], p. 253.

¹⁰⁶ Gottschalk, *De diversis*, *CEG*, pp. 320–1, including his citations to Eph 2, 18; and Hebr 4, 16.

¹⁰⁷ Gottschalk, *De diversis*, *CEG*, p. 323: “Attamen quia te ducente trahente ferente per te rectissimam viam confugi miser et infelix ad te piissimam vitam, quantacumque possum cordis et corporis humilitate cernuus exoro semper adorandum colendum tremendum piissimum dominum deum meum te, secundum multitudinem miserationum tuarum respice in me. Credo siquidem firmissime et scio tibi deo gratias certissime quia tu domine redemptor atque salvator mundi si vis

Using passages from Psalms 31 and 142, Gottschalk reminded Christ that he had sought refuge with him, contrasting divine omnipotence with his own sinful impotence. He claimed he was God's devoted servant in the hope that he would be rewarded with the same promise of salvation given to the psalmist in Psalm 31, 8. Yet his plea for help was also evidence of his true humility. While Christ and his grace remained supreme in the process of his transformation into a contrite sinner, Gottschalk nonetheless revealed that he played a part in the process by seeking Christ's help, the source of salvation for the humble. Yet even this was evidence of grace, and since he had done so, he might now ask God to grant him salvation.

Gottschalk also adopted the image of the leper for himself in the prayer, which he had used in the 830s in his hymn, *Christe rex regum*, when seeking grace as Christ's client and humble servant. In the *De diversis* prayer, however, Gottschalk subtly changed the image to ask for divine protection from his enemy rather than simply to be healed of sin. Drawing from Matthew's Gospel, he used the words of the leper who believed that Christ could heal him to characterize himself as one not only in need of help, but one who believed that the savior could bring it about.¹⁰⁸ Again, Gottschalk cast himself as utterly dependent on God and asking for aid. Yet he begged to be saved and freed from his enemies and sins rather than cleansed (*mundare*) of his disease. Here one cannot help but think of Hincmar's last effort to tempt Gottschalk to abandon his doctrines with his promise of the Eucharist and a proper burial. With the words of Psalm 31, Gottschalk begged for the same aid he had received before: "You are my refuge from the tribulation which surrounded me, rescue me, my exultation, from those surrounding me." At the mercy of his enemy and tempted by his offer, Gottschalk turned to Christ for protection and forgiveness.

The last biblical reference in his final prayer is the most telling: Gottschalk closed his prayer with the hymn of praise sung by the angels and elect of the heavenly host in Revelation. Having made his appeal for salvation by recounting his humility and total surrender to Christ, he ended by offering thanks with the very laudation of the elect in heaven—as if he were among them himself—making his prayer quite similar to his *Christe rex regum* as a "speech act" signifying the enactment of his election.¹⁰⁹ If Hincmar's account was his final condemnation of a twenty-year adversary, this prayer was Gottschalk's finale: his ultimate self-confirmation that he was a recipient of divine grace.

potes <me> salvare et ab omnibus peccatis et hostibus meis omni modo liberare. Proinde tibi domino deo misericordissimo salutari meo ex totis praecordiis meis me supplicando dicente: Tu es refugium meum a tribulatione quae circumdedit me, exultatio mea erue me a circumdantibus me, dignare quod sequitur quaeso etiam mihi mendacissimo et licet penitus indignissimo tui tamen nimis in omnibus ut intueris iugiter indigentissimo respondere gratis clementer ac dicere: Intellectum tibi dabo et instruum te in via hac qua gradieris, firmabo super te oculos meos. Amen. Benedictio et claritas et sapientia et gratiarum actio et honor et virtus et fortitudo deo nostro in saecula saeculorum. Amen."

¹⁰⁸ Mt 8, 1–4.

¹⁰⁹ See the discussion of this hymn in Chapter 3.

These two conflicting descriptions of Gottschalk's death, and his appearance in Hautvillers' *necrologium*, underscore the restrictions on Hincmar's authority over Gottschalk and his fellow monks. With the exception of someone like Guntbert, we cannot know for certain to what extent these monks accepted Gottschalk's particular doctrines. Yet the monks' prayers for Gottschalk suggests that many believed he had been treated wrongly by Hincmar and his other enemies. In such circumstances, they allowed Gottschalk access to writing materials, sent out his texts to other locations, and discussed his ideas with him. These same *fratres* were most likely the ones who preserved his writings after his death just as they preserved his memory. It was these monks who were responsible for giving Gottschalk the opportunity to write about himself and his doctrines as he wished for nearly two decades through intense periods of controversy. This consistent support is compelling evidence that the vision of himself, which he presented in his works, was one that accorded with his readers and helpers at Hautvillers.

CONCLUSION

Guntbert's attempts to seek papal intervention on his master's behalf indicate how easily controversy surrounding Gottschalk and his ideas could have exploded once more in his last years at Hautvillers. While the sources are unclear about what role Pope Nicholas might have played in such a scenario, the drama surrounding Guntbert's efforts showed the potential of Gottschalk's case for compelling even the pope to become embroiled in the affair. The anxiety these events produced in Hincmar as an embattled bishop and administrator should not be underestimated. Even with Gottschalk "safely" contained inside Hautvillers, Hincmar was forced to keep vigilant about the possibility of his contagion spreading. Hautvillers itself was a compromised space, since Gottschalk continued to be helped by at least some of the brothers there despite Guntbert's ejection from the monastic community. As in the late 840s and 850s, Gottschalk's encounters with Hincmar were opportunities for choreographing resistance and enacting election within his monastic prison.

Gottschalk framed this holy dissent in terms of piety and learning. His severe criticisms of Hincmar's antiphonary suggest that he encouraged the Hautvillers monks to imagine how the contagion of heresy and the dangers of blasphemy in the liturgy were *outside* the monastery, where the archbishop held sway. Within the monastery, Gottschalk served as the counter-pole of orthodoxy and authoritative knowledge to Hincmar's heretical tyranny. Gottschalk's study of the antiphonary highlights the power of the liturgy in monastic circles, where so much of their lived religious experienced was framed by liturgical practice and expression. Likewise, this chapter's examination of his criticisms of the antiphonary shed light on the history of blasphemy by linking it with heresy in early medieval thought, a hitherto unexplored area of research. Gottschalk's criticisms were also meant to counter Hincmar's adoption of the Remigius' narrative in Frankish history in order to make his see a focal point for the holy power of anointing kings, implying that

church history played a key role in holy dissent at Hautvillers alongside grammar and theology.

Even in the 860s Gottschalk was able to leave a remarkable footprint in the historical record despite Hincmar's attempts to erase any memory of him besides the fact that he was an irredeemable heretic. Gottschalk's last prayer and his inclusion in Hautvillers' *necrologium* call to mind an atmosphere of piety, learning, and love in stark contrast to Hincmar's portrayal of Gottschalk's miserable end without the spiritual comforts of the sacrament and a proper burial. Indeed, Gottschalk's last years at Hautvillers denote both that Hincmar's ability to control the monks of his see was limited, and that the darker and more coercive side of cloister life could be mitigated by sympathetic monks unwilling to accept what seemed to be an illegitimate degree of punishment. These are points worth considering. Certainly Gottschalk was never allowed to leave Hautvillers, a circumstance that he transformed into an act of pious resistance according to his own understanding of divine election. Yet Gottschalk's later career also shows something fascinating and often difficult to see about life in a Carolingian cloister, which is that individual monks were able to limit the most severe aspects of the apparatus of monastic correction by comforting and supporting those they deemed unjustly targeted by it.

Conclusion

Heresy and Dissent in the Carolingian Empire

Throughout a career that spanned some of the most stormy and transformative decades of early medieval Europe, Gottschalk—or “God’s Servant” as he so frequently described himself—voiced dissent with remarkable ingenuity in controversies and scandals often of his own design. He displayed a conspicuous talent for gaining supporters in these conflicts, while provoking intense personal hatred and spiritual loathing among those authority figures he resisted. While the murky historical record of pre-millennial Europe admittedly abounds in gaps and uncertainties, the extant sources offer no one comparable to this ninth-century oblate, Saxon noble, Gallic monk, Latin poet, priest, missionary, vagabond, theologian, know-it-all, martyr, self-proclaimed miracle-worker, excommunicant, prophet, pseudochrist, teacher, heretic, grammarian, spiritual contagion, hymnist, demonic agent, servant of God. Because of his unique place in the early Middle Ages, this book has foregrounded Gottschalk’s individual experiences and concerns with an eye for opening up new vantage points onto some darker aspects of Carolingian religious history. “Dark” is used here not only because investigating his story has brought to light previously unexamined or disconnected issues from frequently scanty and obscure material, but also because such a study has made it possible to illuminate the regime’s use of coercion and its anxieties about sin by seeing them through the eyes of someone targeted repeatedly for correction.

By viewing Carolingian religion from the perspective of empire’s most notorious religious outlaw, this study has sought to link Frankish Christianity to the wider history of religious authority and dissent in medieval Europe and beyond. Indeed, Gottschalk’s case is critical for rethinking the Frankish empire’s place in this longer history, since the kinds of hierarchical practices for controlling religious thought and behavior existing before and after the Carolingian period clearly predominated in that era as well. That his story took place in that axial moment when the Frankish empire divided into those separate, competing kingdoms which largely continued to thrive in the medieval and early modern periods underscores the importance of his case. Gottschalk’s outlook on the empire’s religion is also crucial for perceiving how the Carolingian regime’s understanding of the cosmic order, and the empire’s place within that order, was very much an intellectual, imaginative construct designed by the politico-religious hierarchy for the purpose of maintaining its power as a “natural” and “good” state of affairs. The Frankish elite developed its politics and a unique sense of religious identity as the *populus Dei* through espousing claims to “correct” Christianity that justified wars of conquest, whose aims included reforming non-Frankish Christians or converting pagans, along with

a vast project of internal religious transformation meant to bring divine favor to the empire and preserve its order under the regime's guidance.

As this book has argued, the Carolingian Empire's reforming society embraced coercive, pious correction as the central tool for maintaining its order, reserving persecution to rare incidents of religious defiance. Indeed, the Frankish world's response to error was remarkably different from Moore's persecuting society of later centuries, since the Carolingian hierarchy preferred enforcing discipline and participation in their reform program to the widespread practices of exclusion and execution in subsequent eras. Gottschalk's case has shown how such correction could take severe form when authorities felt threatened by those beneath them. His experiences with Hrabanus at Fulda and during his later incarceration at Hautvillers, for example, demonstrate clearly how coercion could significantly shape cloister life. The events of the Synod of Mainz (829) showed the ongoing relevance of the violent conquest and forced conversion of the Saxons decades after those events. Most strikingly, Gottschalk's career repeatedly brought into focus the strictness of episcopal authority at work, such as when he was punished by Ebbo of Rheims for allegedly participating in the Loyal Rebellion in 830, and by bishops in the 840s for his disobedience and contumacy as a monk and priest, who rejected correction as he usurped episcopal control of doctrine and the power to define orthodoxy and heresy. Gottschalk's own aggressive approaches to converting non-Christians and to engaging in intellectual confrontations over doctrinal questions certainly fit squarely within the Carolingian tradition of coercive practices. That aspects of personal enmity between Gottschalk and his superiors helped frame his encounters with episcopal correction underscores that personality and subjective experience could be important factors in how the process of reform played out in specific cases.

These coercive tendencies point to the regime's chief anxiety, to that dark force which threatened its power and the prosperity of the empire in this world and the salvation of Christians in the next: the polluting contagion of sin. Fear of sin's corruptive, destructive capacity encouraged tough imperial practices for punishing and correcting offenders, as well as for eliminating their pollution so as to restore them to the community whenever possible. When such contagion could not be eliminated, however, its source was to be physically and forcibly contained, though not violently destroyed through public execution as it would be in later centuries. Carolingian authorities portrayed in their writings the practices of controlling the danger of sin as necessary and just, generating a remarkably convincing pretence of consensus on this issue which the modern historian's gaze has difficulty penetrating. But Gottschalk's career has made it possible to go beyond this façade and to realize how there was also a tendency in the empire to protect friends, allies, and underlings from such coercion or, at least, to alleviate its harshness at times—however much correction was collectively valued as a means for eliminating sin and error from the community.

Indeed, Gottschalk repeatedly found sources of help in difficult times. In 829, for instance, Hatto of Fulda and the bishops at the Synod of Mainz enabled him to escape from Fulda and Hrabanus' authority, while in the early 830s Archbishop Ebbo and Abbot Peter of Hautvillers offered him support during a period of

sustained upheaval. Italian clerics, including Lupus of Chieti, as well as Duke Eberhard of Friuli and Prince Trpimir were his allies in the 840s, and—of course—his monastic friends and followers at Hautvillers and more broadly in Charles the Bald's kingdom supported him after his condemnations for heresy. At every stage in his career, Gottschalk was aided by people who identified with him or his ideas, and who either protected him from the forces of correction or sought to limit the severity of his punishment. Certainly this impulse toward reducing the coercive tendencies in Carolingian Christianity was not confined to Gottschalk's experiences, which suggests that there was a wider awareness about the need to restrain the apparatus of reform on those occasions when it seemed unjustly applied or excessively cruel.

Gottschalk's ability to win over the support of so many people indicates how his modes of dissent frequently spoke to concerns about limiting the harshness of correction. For example, in his correspondence with Archbishop Ebbo over his suspected involvement in the Loyal Rebellion he admonished the archbishop for wrongly and unjustly condemning him at a time when concerns over the abuse of ministerial authority in the empire were at their height. Yet Gottschalk also embraced much of the stern Carolingian reform tradition for his own purposes. His uncompromising strategies of dissent emulated the rigor of imperial practices, while they were simultaneously deployed to overcome that tradition's hierarchical nature. He adopted the confrontational missionary style in his dealings with non-Christians and Christians alike, displaying well-honed skills of debate that he unflinchingly used against his ecclesiastical superiors. Central to those skills was his appropriation of biblical and patristic textual authorities for his own positions, and how he developed logical arguments from these authorities to force his opponents whether they were willing or not to agree with him or to fall silent. Many of these practices were available to other ninth-century intellectuals, but Gottschalk assembled them into a unique intellectual arsenal and put them to uncommon ends. Rather than avoiding scandal, he embraced it for the truth's sake and combined his ruthless arguments with a fierce posture meant to impress, intimidate, or even insult his contemporaries regardless of their rank. His shocking claim, for example, that Christ did not die for all baptized Christians was one he defended with great tenacity and absolute confidence in its veracity throughout his career.

Perhaps Gottschalk's most compelling mode of dissent was to refuse abbatial and episcopal correction, since it denied those superiors the respect and obedience assumed by their status. To make such a refusal in the Carolingian Empire was to call into question the accepted world order, which was a refusal that caused his actions to resonate with those who felt their ecclesiastical leaders were tyrannical rather than benevolent. Indeed, Gottschalk's unique combination of creative thought and subversive politics here illuminates how the period's apparent proclivity for intellectual conservatism and obedience to hierarchy were actually well-honed political strategies practiced by a highly-trained ecclesiastical elite operating within accepted bounds in order to preserve that order. Yet Gottschalk argued that it was his heretical opponents who were against the divine order by resisting God through their abuse of authority and their error. He used his condemnations at

church synods as opportunities to provoke his ecclesiastical superiors to act sternly in what he regarded as unjust persecution, transforming what were supposed to be occasions of correction into evidence of his election, while marking the bishops as oppressors and him as a martyr. In his confessional texts, he compared himself to Augustine and claimed personal holiness as a vessel for the divine power of miracles and prophecies, appropriating the Christian tradition of orthodoxy and the history of the Roman persecutions to frame his own experiences. Taking on a leading role in the dissent against Archbishop Hincmar in the 850s, Gottschalk continued to refuse to accept correction during his long imprisonment and encouraged supporters to confess his doctrines and follow his example of pious resistance in an underground community of the faithful during a time of persecution by heretical bishops.

The creativity and experimentalism of Gottschalk's modes of dissent were linked to his noteworthy understanding of the universe, which was sharply opposed to his enemies' sense of world order. Here the importance of considering theology as politics on a cosmic scale in Carolingian history is evident. Seeing the world from a God's-eye view, Gottschalk claimed that humanity was already divided between the elect and the reprobate: baptism was no guarantee of the possibility of salvation, since wicked Christians were not, are not, and would not be saved by an omnipotent God whose omniscience afforded absolute knowledge of those deigned worth saving. In this vision of cosmic holism, divine activities and creation worked together as a single metaphysical organism without contradiction: the elect went to Heaven thanks to grace and the damned went to Hell because of their own evil. In fact, the experience of election and damnation were a part of lived human experience as well as the afterlife, and in connection with this belief Gottschalk sought to identify the elect and to distinguish them from the reprobate in the here and now. Such identification included confessing his doctrine of grace. By demanding such a confession, Gottschalk laid claim to the Carolingian imperial tradition of requiring baptism and a profession of faith from its subjects. Expressing one's faith was an acknowledgment of the order of the universe, and one's place within it, an act that was as much political as it was religious. Gottschalk's answer to the question "Whom does the deity favor?" was quite different than that of his opponents, who argued that all imperial subjects had the *potential* to be among those favored by their God. Gottschalk, contrastingly, claimed that there was no ambiguity here, since only the elect were favored, and identification with his doctrine signified this election for believers as much in the here and now as in eternity.

Gottschalk's doctrine cast the Carolingian Empire's struggle against the polluting and perverting power of sin into doubt by appropriating that struggle for himself and his followers. The *populus Dei* could not be identified with the heretical imperial church, he argued, since only the elect—the persecuted faithful—were God's own. According to this logic, the struggle against sin could only be won by the elect because of unfailing divine grace, while the reprobate constituted those very sinful, corrupting, and malevolent forces in conflict against them. The connections between Gottschalk's worldview and his activities of dissent are obvious. To be a theologian in the Carolingian Empire was to make claims about the order of the universe and everyone's place within that order, which meant that the

theologian was commenting on the place of the empire and its church in salvation history. Gottschalk's case may have been the most dramatic in terms of his opposition to the established hierarchy and his arguments that the imperial church was plagued with heresy, but the assumptions he made as a theologian were squarely Carolingian: he rejected with horror the polluting power of sin and sought to separate himself and the faithful (meaning the elect) from its most deadly source—error. So, though his activities and teachings contradicted those of his opponents, Gottschalk operated with a common set of theological expectations and goals, a fact that reveals the links between politics and doctrine in the Carolingian Empire all too clearly.

Another theme of this book has been Gottschalk's talent for developing uncommon claims about who he was from the common repertoire of early medieval ideas, concepts, identifications, and images. He did so in changing circumstances throughout his career with different aims in mind, demonstrating how he was simply not reducible either to his ethnic identity or to his doctrine of predestination. Instead, he cast himself in varying roles, depending on how he wanted to frame the outcome of his interactions with others—so that he could as easily praise a bishop as scold him, encourage a young monk or friend as much as admonish him. In fact, the number of Gottschalk's documented encounters with figures from high-ranking leaders down to nameless correspondents was impressive: it included secular rulers, such as King Trpimir of the Croats, Duke Eberhard of Friuli, a pagan Bulgar notable, and figures of prominence among the Venetians and Dalmatians on the Adriatic; bishops throughout the empire, including Amolo of Lyons, Bernold of Strasbourg, Ebbo of Rheims, Lupus of Chieti, Hrabanus Maurus of Mainz, Hincmar of Rheims, and Prudentius of Troyes; famous intellectuals and missionaries, such as Giselmair of Corbie, Ratramnus of Corbie, Walafrid Strabo, and Lupus of Ferrières; monks at Hautvillers such as Guntbert; and the numerous anonymous monks and clerics who corresponded with him in the 850s and 860s. This surviving record suggests very strongly that Gottschalk had a great diversity of contacts and experiences as he traveled across Europe, signaling how little is recoverable today about the personal relationships of even relatively well-documented early medieval individual lives.

Gottschalk naturalized his self-identifications as true through actions and words. Readers were to understand that he *was* innocent of conspiring against Emperor Louis and Archbishop Ebbo in 830 because he confessed that innocence not only to the archbishop, but also to his all-knowing and omnipotent divine patron, Christ. In this same fashion, Gottschalk *was* one of the elect, because he properly resisted his heretical enemies and because he wrote like one in artful Latin that wove scripture and patristic authorities into a seamless personal confession of timeless, irrefutable truth. He also *was* destined for salvation despite his utter unworthiness as a sinner, because he sang in his hymns the praises of his God thanks to the gift of salvific grace. In these and other identifications, Gottschalk sought to create a link between belief, reality in the world, representation, and intellectual argument so that his assertions about himself took on a truth of their own and thereby shaped lived experience.

Of course, Gottschalk's contemporaries formulated their own versions of who he was to serve their own ends. Assembling their images of him together with his own identifications from the extant sources today results in a substantial collection of many different, often contradictory Gottschalks, all referring to the same human being. Historically, these different Gottschalks were situational constructs, matters of perspective and conviction meant to make sense of him and his ideas in particular conditions. These constructs, therefore, were claims about who he was in relation to others, claims that could take on cosmic significance since they were frequently related to the Christian God and questions about whom that deity favored. In fact, what has made Gottschalk such a worthwhile subject for meditating on the complexities of Carolingian Christianity is how he repeatedly managed to compel others to believe that answering the question "Whom does the deity favor?" meant determining who Gottschalk was in relation to them. This was as much true at the Synod of Mainz (829) and in his dealings with Archbishop Ebbo in the early 830s as it was during the heated doctrinal disputes later in his career. Gottschalk made himself a catalyst for thinking and debating about salvation and he forced others to base their positions on this issue in relation to him—something which few other early medieval individuals achieved so often and so decisively during their lifetime. All of this Gottschalk accomplished not through the recognized authority and privileges of high office, but through a unique array of strategies for causing controversy and scandal, and he did so very much to the frustration of horrified superiors whose goal it was to prevent or to correct such upheavals at all costs in order to preserve the sense of order that justified their power.

Bibliography

MANUSCRIPTS

Autun, Bibliothèque Municipale 33
Bern Bürgerbibliothek 83
Bern Bürgerbibliothek 584
Paris B.N.F. Lat. 2773
Paris B.N.F. Lat. 9903
Paris B.N.F. Lat. 11902
Paris B.N.F. Lat. 12150
Paris B.N.F. Lat. 12292
Paris B.N.F. Lat. 17991
Reims BM 316
Vat. lat. 7803
Voss. Lat. Q. 17

PRIMARY SOURCES

Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha and Passio sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli, ed. Richard Adelbert Lipsius and Max Bonnet (New York, 1972).
Alcuin, *Commentariorum in Joannem*, *PL* 100: 743–1008.
Alcuin, *De fide sanctae trinitatis*, *PL* 101: 9–64.
Alcuin, *De virtutibus et vitiis liber*, *PL* 101: 613–38.
Alcuin, *Epistolae*, ed. Ernst Dümmler, *MGH Epp.* II (Berlin, 1885), pp. 1–481.
Alcuin, *Explanatio in epistolam Pauli ad Titum*, *PL* 100: 1007–86.
Alcuin, *Officia per ferias*, *PL* 101: 509–612.
Alcuin, *Liber contra haeresim Felicis*, ed. Gary Blumenshine (Vatican City, 1980).
Alcuin, *Septem libri contra Felicem*, *PL* 101: 119–230.
Die althochdeutschen Glossen, ed. Elias Steinmeyer and Eduard Sievers (Berlin, 1879–1922).
Ambrose, *Explanatio psalmorum xii*, ed. M. Petschenig, *CSEL* 64 (Vienna, 1919).
Ambrose, *Epistulae*, ed. Otto Faller, *CSEL* 82 (Vienna, 1968).
Amolo, *Epistola* 2, ed. Ernst Dümmler, *MGH Epp.* V (Berlin, 1899), pp. 368–78; and *Epistola ad Gothescalcum*, *PL* 116: 84–96.
Annales Bertiniani (Annales de Saint-Bertin), ed. Félix Grat, Jeanne Vielliard, and Suzanne Clémencet (Paris, 1964). English translation: *The Annals of St-Bertin*, trans. Janet Nelson (Manchester, 1991).
Annales Fuldenses, ed. Friedrich Kurze, *MGH SSRG* 7 (Hanover, 1891).
Annales Laureshamenses, ed. Georg Pertz, *MGH SS I* (Hanover 1826), pp. 22–39.
Annales regni Francorum, ed. Georg Pertz and Friederich Kurze, *MGH SSRG* 6 (Hanover, 1895).
Annales Xantenses, ed. Bernhard von Simson, *MGH SSRG* 12 (Hanover, 1909).
Antiphonale missarum, *PL* 78: 641–724.
Antiphonale missarum sextuplex, ed. René-Jean Hesbert (Rome, 1967).
Arator, *Historia apostolica.*, ed. A.P. Orbán, *CCSL* 130 (Turnhout, 2006).
Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici imperatoris*, ed. Ernst Tremp, *MGH SSRG* 64 (Hanover, 1995).

- Athanasius, *Vita beati Antonii abbatis*, trans. Evagrius, *PL* 73: 125–70; and Athanasius, *Vie d'Antoine*, trans. Gerard J.M. Bartelink (Paris, 1994).
- Augustine, *Confessiones*, ed. Lucas Verheijen, *CCSL* 27 (Turnhout, 1981); and *Confessiones*, ed. Martin Skutella, rev. ed. H. Jürgens and W. Schaub (Leipzig, 1996).
- Augustine, *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum*, *PL* 44: 547–638.
- Augustine, *Contra Julianum*, *PL* 44: 637–874.
- Augustine, *De agone Christi*, *PL* 40: 289–310.
- Augustine, *De baptismo contra Donatistas libri septem*, *PL* 43: 107–244.
- Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, ed. Bernard Dombart and Alfons Kalb, *CCSL* 47 (Turnhout, 1955).
- Augustine, *De consensu evangelistarum libri quattuor*, ed. Franz Wehrich, *CSEL* 43 (Vienna, 1904).
- Augustine, *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, ed. Jean Chéné and Jacques Pintard (Paris, 1962).
- Augustine, *De perfectione*, ed. Charles Urba and Josef Zycha, *CSEL* 42 (Vienna, 1902).
- Augustine, *De perfectione iustitiae hominis*, ed. Charles Urba and Josef Zycha, *CSEL* 42 (Vienna, 1902).
- Augustine, *De praedestinatione sanctorum*, ed. Jean Chéné and Jacques Pintard (Paris, 1962).
- Augustine, *De symbolo sermo ad catechumenos*, *PL* 40: 637–52.
- Augustine, *De Trinitate*, ed. William J. Mountain, *CCSL* 50–50A (Turnhout, 1968).
- Augustine, *Enarrationes in psalmos*, ed. Eligius Dekkers and Johannes Fraipont, *CCSL* 38–38B (Turnhout, 1956).
- Augustine, *Enchiridion ad Laurentium de fide et spe et caritate*, ed. Ernest Evans, *CCSL* 46 (Turnhout, 1988).
- Augustine, *Epistolae*, *PL* 33: 13–1094.
- Augustine, *In Johannis evangelium tractatus CXXIV*, ed. Radbod Willems, *CCSL* 36 (Turnhout, 1954).
- Augustine, *Sermones*, *PL* 38–39, including some Pseudo-Augustinian texts. English translation: Augustine, *Sermons*, trans. Edmund Hill, *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century*, 10 vols. (New York, 1990–5).
- Bede, *In epistulas septem catholicas*, ed. David Hurst, *CCSL* 121 (Turnhout, 1983).
- Bede, *In Ezram et Neemiam*, ed. David Hurst, *CCSL* 119A (Turnhout, 1969).
- Bede, *In Lucae evangelium expositio*, ed. David Hurst, *CCSL* 120 (Turnhout, 1960).
- Bede, *In Marcae evangelium expositio*, ed. David Hurst, *CCSL* 120 (Turnhout, 1960).
- Bede, *Martyrologium*, *PL* 94: 799–1148; and *Edition pratique des Martyrologes de Bede de l'anonyme lyonnais et de Florus*, ed. Jacques Dubois and Geneviève Renaud (Paris, 1976).
- Bede, *Opera exegetica*, ed. David Hurst, *CCSL* 119–119A (Turnhout, 1962–9).
- Benedict of Aniane, *Concordia regularum*, ed. Pierre Bonnerue, *CCCM* 168A (Turnhout, 1999).
- Benedict of Aniane, *Disputatio adversus Felicianam impietatem*, *PL* 103: 1399–411.
- Breviarium gothicum*, *PL* 86: 885–939.
- Breviarium in Psalmos*, *PL* 26: 821–1270.
- Candidus, *Vita Eigilis abbatis Fuldensis*, ed. Georg Waitz, *MGH SS* 15 (Hanover, 1887), pp. 221–33.
- Capitularia regum Francorum*, ed. Alfred Boretius and Viktor Krause, *MGH Cap.* I–II (Hanover, 1883–97).
- Cassiodorus, *Expositio Psalmorum*, ed. Marcus Adriaen, *CCSL* 97–8 (Turnhout, 1958).
- Celestine I, *Epistola ad Nestorium*, *PL* 50: 473.
- Charles the Bald, *Epistula ad Nicholam*, *PL* 124: 870–5.
- Chronicon Laurissense breve*, ed. Hans Schnorr von Carolsfeld, *Neues Archiv* 36 (1910/1911) pp. 15–39.

- Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, ed. Tadija Smiciklas, vol. I (Zagreb, 1967).
- Coelestinus I, *Epistolae* 31, *PL* 50: 528–37.
- Concilia aevi Karolini*, ed. Albert Werminghoff, *MGH Conc.* I–II (Hanover, 1906–8).
- Concilia Galliae a. 314–a. 506*, ed. Charles Munier, *CCSL* 148 (Turnhout, 1963).
- Concilia Hispaniae*, *PL* 84: 301–626.
- Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, ed. Norman Tanner et al., 2 vols. (Washington DC, 1990).
- Dhuoda, *Manuel pour mon fils*, ed. Pierre Riché, trans. Bernard de Vregille and Claude Mondésert (Paris, 1991).
- Die Admonitio generalis Karls des Großen*, ed. Hubert Mordek, Klaus Zechiel-Eckes, and Michael Glatthaar, *MGH Fontes iuris germanici antiqui in usum scholarum separatim editi* 16 (Hanover, 2012).
- Dionysius Exiguus, *Collectio decretorum pontificorum Romanorum*, *PL* 67: 229–316.
- Donatus, *Ars major*, ed. Louis Holtz, *Donat et la tradition de l'enseignement grammatical: étude sur l'Ars Donati et sa diffusion (IVe–IXe siècle) et édition critique* (Paris, 1981).
- Eigil, *Vita sancti Sturmii*, ed. Pius Engelbert, *Die Vita Sturmii des Eigil von Fulda: literarkritisch-historische Untersuchung und Edition* (Marburg, 1968).
- Einhard, *Historia translationis beatorum Christi martyrum Marcellini et Petri*, ed. Georg Waitz, *MGH SS* 15 (Hanover, 1887), pp. 238–64.
- Einhard, *Vita Karoli*, ed. Georg Waitz, *MGH SSRG* 25 (Hanover, 1911).
- Epistolarum Fuldensium fragmenta*, ed. Ernst Dümmler, *MGH Epp.* V (Berlin, 1928), pp. 517–33.
- Ermenric, *Epistola ad Grimaldum abbatem monasterii S. Galli*, ed. Ernst Dümmler, *MGH Epp.* V (Berlin, 1899), pp. 536–79.
- Ermold the Black, *Poème sur Louis le Pieux et épîtres au roi Pépin*, ed. and trans. Edmond Faral (Paris, 1932).
- Eucherius of Lyons, *Formulae spiritalis intellegentiae*, ed. Carmela Mandolfo, *CCSL* 66 (Turnhout, 2004).
- Floard of Reims, *Historia Remensis ecclesiae*, ed. Martina Stratmann, *MGH SS* 36 (Hanover, 1998).
- Florus of Lyons, *Opera polemica*, ed. Klaus Zechiel-Eckes with the assistance of Erwin Frauenknecht, *CCCM* 260 (Turnhout, 2014).
- Formulae Merovingici et Karolini aevi*, ed. Karl Zeumer *MGH Legum* V (Hanover, 1886).
- Fulgentius, *Opera*, ed. Jean Fraipont, *CCSL* 91–91A (Turnhout, 1968).
- Gennadius of Marseille, *Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum*, ed. Cuthbert Hamilton Turner, *Journal of Theological Studies* 7 (1906), pp. 78–99.
- Gottschalk of Orbais, *Carmina*, ed. Ludwig Traube, *MGH PLAC* III (Berlin, 1896), pp. 707–38.
- Gottschalk of Orbais, *Carmina*, ed. Norbert Fickermann, *MGH PLAC* VI, ed. Karl Strecker (Weimar, 1951), pp. 86–106.
- Gottschalk of Orbais, *Domino clementissimo*, ed. Cyrille Lambot, “Lettre inédite de Godescalc d’Orbais,” *Revue Bénédictine* 68 (1958), pp. 40–51.
- Gottschalk of Orbais, *Ebbo Remense decus*, ed. Ernst Dümmler, *MGH PLAC* I (Berlin, 1881), p. 623.
- Gottschalk of Orbais, *Cœuvres théologiques et grammaticales de Godescalc d’Orbais*, ed. Cyril Lambot (Louvain, 1945).
- Gottschalk of Orbais, *Quo ne tu missus*, ed. Karl Strecker, *MGH PLAC* IV (Berlin, 1914), pp. 934–6; and Fidel Rädle, “Gottschalks Gedicht an seinen letzten Freund,” in *Scire*

- litteras: Forschungen zum mittelalterlichen Geistesleben*, ed. Sigrid Krämer and Michael Bernhard (Munich, 1988), pp. 315–25.
- Gregory the Great, *Der heilige Benedikt. Buch II der Dialoge, lateinisch/deutsch*, ed. Salzburger Äbtekonzferenz (St. Ottilien, 1995).
- Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob libri*, ed. Marcus Adriaen, CCSL 143–142B (Turnhout, 1979–85).
- Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum*, ed. Bruno Krusch and Wilhelm Levison, MGH SSRM I (Hanover, 1965).
- Halitgar of Cambrai, *Liber poenitentialis*, PL 105: 651–710.
- Heliand und Genesis*, ed. Hermann Paul and Otto Behaghel, 10th ed. (Tübingen, 1996).
English translation: *The Heliand: The Saxon Gospel*, tr. Ronald Murphy (Oxford, 1992).
- Hilary of Poitiers, *Commentarius in evangelium Matthaei*, PL 9: 917–1078.
- Hilary of Poitiers, *De Trinitate*, ed. Pieter Smulders, CCSL 62–62A (Turnhout, 1979–80).
- Hildemar, *Epistola* 33, ed. Ernst Dümmler, MGH Epp. V (Berlin, 1899), pp. 355–7.
- Hincmar of Reims, *Ad reclusos et simplices*, ed. Wilhelm Gundlach, “Zwei Schriften des Erzbischofs Hinkmar von Reims II,” *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 10 (1889) pp. 258–310.
- Hincmar of Reims, *Consilium de poenitentia Pippini regis*, PL 125: 1119–22.
- Hincmar of Reims, *De coercendo et exstirpando raptu viduarum, puellarum ac sanctimonialium*, PL 125: 1017–36.
- Hincmar of Reims, *De divortio Lotharii regis et Theutbergae reginae*, MGH Conc. IV, Supp. I, ed. Letha Böhringer (Hanover, 1992).
- Hincmar of Reims, *De una et non trina deitate*, ed. Jacques Sirmond, *Hincmari archiepiscopi Remensis opera*, vol. I (Paris, 1645), pp. 413–555, reprinted: PL 125: 473–618.
- Hincmar of Reims, *Epistolae*, ed. Ernst Perels, MGH Epp. VIII (Berlin, 1939).
- Hincmar of Reims, *Liber de praedestinatione*, ed. Jacques Sirmond, *Hincmari archiepiscopi Remensis opera*, vol. I (Paris, 1645), pp. 1–410, reprinted: PL 125: 65–474.
- Hincmar of Reims, *Vita Remigii*, ed. Bruno Krusch, MGH SSRM I (Hanover, 1896), pp. 239–349.
- Historia translationis sancti Viti*, ed. Georg Pertz, MGH SS II (Hanover, 1829), pp. 576–85.
- Hrabanus Maurus, *Commentaria in libros iv Regum*, PL 109: 9–280.
- Hrabanus Maurus, *Commentarium in Exodum*, PL 108: 9–246.
- Hrabanus Maurus, *Commentarium in Ezechielem*, PL 110: 497–1084.
- Hrabanus Maurus, *Commentarium in Leviticum*, PL 108: 245–586.
- Hrabanus Maurus, *Commentarium in librum Ecclesiasticum*, PL 109: 763–1126.
- Hrabanus Maurus, *Commentarium in librum Iudicum*, PL 108: 1111–200.
- Hrabanus Maurus, *Commentarium in librum Judith*, PL 109: 539–92.
- Hrabanus Maurus, *Commentarium in librum Ruth*, PL 108: 1199–224.
- Hrabanus Maurus, *Commentarium in librum Sapientiae*, PL 109: 671–762.
- Hrabanus Maurus, *De institutione clericorum*, ed. and trans. Detlev Zimpel, 2 vols. (Turnhout, 2006).
- Hrabanus Maurus, *De universo*, PL 111: 9–614.
- Hrabanus Maurus, *Enarrationes in epistolas beati Pauli*, PL 111: 1273–616 and PL 112: 9–834.
- Hrabanus Maurus, *Enarrationes in librum Numerorum*, PL 108: 587–838.
- Hrabanus Maurus, *Epistola Ad Notingum, cum libro de praedestinatione Dei*, PL 112: 1530–53.
- Hrabanus Maurus, *Epistulae*, ed. Ernst Dümmler, MGH Epp. V (Berlin, 1898–9).
- Hrabanus Maurus, *Expositio in Mattheum*, ed. Bengt Löfstedt, CCCM 174–174A (Turnhout, 2000).

- Hrabanus Maurus, *Homiliae*, PL 110: 9–468.
- Hrabanus Maurus, *Liber de oblatione puerorum*, PL 107: 419–40.
- Hrabanus Maurus, *Martyrologium*, ed. John McCulloh, CCCM 44 (Turnholt, 1979).
- Hrabanus Maurus, *Metrum de transitu monachorum*, ed. Ernst Dümmler, MGH PLAC II (Berlin, 1884), pp. 204–5.
- Innocent I, *Epistola* 30, PL 20: 589–93.
- Isidore of Seville, *De viris illustribus*, PL 83: 1081–106.
- Isidore of Seville, *Diferencias libro I*, ed. Carmen Codoñer (Paris, 1992).
- Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, ed. W.M. Lindsay (Oxford, 1911).
- Isidore of Seville, *Sententiae*, ed. Pierre Cazier, CCSL 111 (Turnhout, 1998).
- Isidore of Seville, *Synonyma de lamentatione animae peccatrix*, PL 83: 825–68.
- Jerome, *Commentarii in epistolam Pauli Apostoli ad Galatas*, ed. Giacomo Raspanti, CCSL 77A (Turnhout, 2006).
- Jerome, *Commentarii in prophetas*, ed. Marcus Adriaen, CCSL 76–76A (Turnhout, 1969–70).
- Jerome, *Commentariorum in Hiezechielem*, ed. François Glorie, CCSL 75 (Turnhout, 1964).
- Jerome, *Commentariorum in Matheum libri IV*, ed. David Hurst and Marcus Adriaen, CCSL 77 (Turnhout, 1969).
- Jerome, *Contra Vigilantium*, ed. J.-L. Feiertag, CCSL 79C (Turnhout, 2005).
- Jerome, *Epistolae*, PL 22: 325–1224.
- Jerome, *In Esaiam*, ed. Marcus Adriaen, CCSL 53 (Turnhout, 1963).
- Jerome, *Tractatus in Psalmos*, ed. Germain Morin, CCSL 78 (Turnhout, 1958).
- John Eriugena, *De divina praedestinatione liber*, ed. Goulven Madec, CCCM 50 (Turnhout, 1978).
- Jonas of Orléans, *De institutione regia*, ed. Alain Dubreucq (Paris, 1995).
- Die Konzilien der karolingischen Teilreiche 843–859*, ed. Wilfried Hartmann, MGH Conc. III (Hanover, 1984).
- Die Konzilien der karolingischen Teilreiche 860–874*, ed. Wilfried Hartmann, MGH Conc. IV (Hanover, 1998).
- Leges Saxonum und Leges Thuringorum*, ed. Claudius von Schwerin, MGH Fontes Iuris Germanici Antiqui 4 (Hannover, 1918).
- Le Liber Pontificalis*, ed. Louis Duchesne, vol. 2 (Paris, 1892).
- Leo IV, *Epistola ad Prudentium*, ed. Ernst Dümmler, MGH Epp. V (Berlin, 1899), p. 611.
- Liber responsorialis*, PL 78: 723–850.
- Liber sacramentorum Augustodunensis*, ed. Odilo Heiming, CCSL 159B (Turnhout, 1984).
- Liber sacramentorum Engolismensis*, ed. Patrick Saint-Roch, CCSL 159C (Turnhout, 1987).
- Liber sacramentorum Gellonensis*, ed. Antoine Dumas, CCSL 99 (Turnhout, 1981).
- The Lives of the Ninth-Century Popes*, ed., trans. and comm. Raymond Davis (Liverpool, 1995).
- Lupus, *Collectaneum de tribus quaestionibus*, PL 119: 647–66.
- Lupus, *Epistolae*, ed. Peter Marshall (Leipzig, 1984).
- Lupus, *Liber de tribus quaestionibus*, PL 119: 619–48.
- Nicholas, *Epistolae* 79–81, ed. Ernst Dümmler, MGH Epp. VI (Berlin, 1925), pp. 414–32.
- Opus Caroli regis contra synodum* (Libri Carolini), ed. Ann Freeman, MGH Conc. II, Supplementum I (Hanover, 1998).
- Paschasius Radbertus, *Epitaphium Arsenii*, ed. Ernst Dümmler (Berlin, 1900).
- Paschasius Radbertus, *Expositio in Matheo libri XII*, ed. Beda Paulus, CCCM 56–56B (Turnhout, 1984).
- Paschasius Radbertus, *Expositio in psalmum xlv*, ed. Beda Paulus, CCCM 94 (Turnhout, 1991).

- Passio Crispini et Crispiniani*, BHL 1900, ed. Michèle Gaillard, in *Le légendier de Turin. MS. D.V.3 de la Bibliothèque Nationale Universitaire*, ed. Monique Goullet with Sandra Isetta (Florence, 2014), pp. 311–21.
- Paulinus of Aquileia, *Contra Felicem Urgellitanum episcopum libri tres*, PL 99: 343–468.
- Paulinus of Aquileia, *Versus de Lazaro*, ed. Karl Strecker, MGH PLAC VI (Munich, 1978), pp. 210–19.
- Paulus Alvarus, *Confessio fidei*, PL 121: 397–412.
- Poetry of the Carolingian Renaissance*, ed. and trans. Peter Godman (Norman, OK: 1985).
- Precum libelli quattuor aevi karolini*, ed. André Wilmart (Rome, 1940).
- Prosper, *De gratia dei et libero voluntatis arbitrio*, PL 51: 205–12.
- Prosper, *Responsiones ad capitula Gallorum*, PL 51: 155–74.
- Prosper, *Responsiones ad capitula Vincentianarum*, PL 51: 177–86.
- Prosper, *Responsiones ad excerpta Genuensium*, PL 51: 187–202.
- Prudentius, *Liber Cathemerinon*, ed. J. Bergmann, CSEL 61 (Vienna, 1926).
- Prudentius of Troyes, *De praedestinatione contra Joannem Scotum*, PL 115: 1009–366.
- Prudentius of Troyes, *Epistola ad Hincmarum et Pardulum*, PL 115: 971–1010.
- Prudentius of Troyes, *Epistola ad Wenilonem*, PL 115: 1365–8.
- The Pseudo-Augustinian Hypomnesticon Against the Pelagians and Celestians*, ed. John Edward Chisholm, 2 vols. (Fribourg, 1967–80).
- Pseudo-Augustine, see: Augustine, *Sermones*.
- Pseudo-Jerome, *De septem ordinibus ecclesiae*, ed. Athanasius Kalff (Bonn, 1935).
- Pseudo-Jerome, *Martyrologium*, PL 30: 437–86.
- Die Pseudoklementinen*, ed. Bernhard Rehm (Berlin, 1965).
- Pseudo-Prosper, *De promissionibus et praedictionibus Dei*, PL 51: 733–858.
- Quidam Saxo Ludowicum I imperatorem orat*, ed. Ernst Dümmler, MGH Epp. V (Berlin, 1899), pp. 300–1.
- Ratramnus, *De praedestinatione dei*, ed. and trans. Timothy Roland Roberts (Dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1977).
- Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve*, ed. Georges Tessier, vol. 3 (Paris, 1955).
- Regesta Imperii: Die Regesten des Regnum Italiae und der burgundischen Regna. Teil 1: Die Karolinger im Regnum Italiae 840–887* (888), ed. Herbert Zielinski (Cologne, 1991).
- La Règle de saint Benoît*, eds., trans. and comm. Adalbert de Vogüé and Jean Neufville, 7 vols. (Paris, 1971–7).
- La règle du maître*, ed. Adalbert de Vogüé, 3 vols. (Paris, 1964).
- Remigius of Auxerre, *Homeliae in Mattheum*, PL 131: 865–932.
- Le sacramentaire Grégorien. Ses principales formes d'après les plus anciens manuscrits*, ed. Jean Deshusses, vol. I (Fribourg, 1971).
- Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, ed. Giovan Domenico Mansi, 31 vols. (Florence, 1758–98).
- Sanctorum meritis inclita gaudia*, ed. Guido Maria Dreves, *Analecta Hymnica* 2 (1888), p. 75.
- Sedulius Scottus, *In Donati artem maiorem*, ed. Bengt Löfstedt, CCCM 40B (Turnhout, 1978).
- Siricius, *Epistola ad Himerium episcopum Tarraconensem*, ed. Klaus Zechiel-Eckes and Detlev Jasper (Hanover, 2013).
- Smaragdus, *Liber in partibus Donati*, ed. Bengt Löfstedt, L. Holtz, and A. Kibre, CCCM 68 (Turnhout, 1986).
- Supplex libellus*, ed. Joseph Semmler, in *Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum. Tomus I Initia Consuetudinis Benedictinae. Consuetudines Saeculi Octavi et Noni*, ed. Kassius Hallinger (Siegburg, 1963), pp. 319–27.

- Tacitus, *De origine et situ Germanorum*, ed. Eric Herbert Warmington (Cambridge, MA: 1980).
- Thegan, *Gesta Hludowici imperatoris*, ed. Ernst Tremp, *MGH SSRG* 64 (Hanover, 1995).
- Theodulf of Orléans, *Contra judices*, ed. Ernst Dümmler, *MGH PLAC* I (Berlin, 1881), pp. 493–517.
- Traditiones et Antiquitates Fuldenses*, ed. Friedrich Dronke (Fulda, 1844).
- Translatio sancti Calixti Cisionium*, ed. Oswald Holder-Egger, *MGH SS* 15 (Berlin, 1887), pp. 418–22.
- Die Urkunden Pippins, Karlmanns und Karls des Grossen*, ed. Engelbert Mühlbacher, *MGH Diplomata* I (Hanover, 1906).
- Venantius Fortunatus, *De cruce domini*, ed. Friedrich Leo, *MGH Auctores Antiquissimi* IV (Berlin, 1881), p. 27.
- Das Verbrüderungsbuch der Abtei Reichenau (Einleitung, Register, Faksimile)*, ed. Johanne Autenrieth, Dieter Geuenich, and Karl Schmid, *MGH Libri memoriales et necrologia nova series* I (Hanover, 1979).
- Vergil, *Opera*, ed. R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969).
- Veterum auctorum qui IX saeculo de praedestinatione et gratia scripserunt opera et fragmenta plurima nunc primum in lucem edita*, ed. Gilbert Maguin, vol. I (Paris, 1650).
- Vincent of Lérins, *Duo commonitoria*, *PL* 50: 637–86.
- Vitae Crispini et Crispiniani, Acta Sanctorum*, October 11 (Brussels, 1864), pp. 495–540.
- Walahfrid, *Carmina*, ed. Ernst Dümmler, *MGH PLAC* II (Berlin, 1884), pp. 259–473.
- Weber, Marie-Luise, *Die Gedichte des Gottschalk von Orbais* (Frankfurt, 1992).
- Zacharias, *Epistola ad Pipinum majorem domus, itemque ad episcopos, abbates, et procures Francorum*, *PL* 89: 930–8.
- Zacharias, *Epistola ad domnum Pippinum*, *PL* 98: 79–92.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Airlie, Stuart, “Bonds of Power and Bonds of Association in the Court Circle of Louis the Pious,” in *CH*, pp. 191–204.
- Airlie, Stuart, “The Aristocracy,” in *NCMH*, pp. 431–50.
- Airlie, Stuart, “Private Bodies and The Body Politic in the Divorce Case of Lothar II,” *Past and Present* 161 (1998), pp. 3–38.
- Althoff, Gerd, *Verwandte, Freunde und Getreue. Zum politischen Stellenwert der Gruppenbindungen im früheren Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 1990). English translation: *Family, Friends and Followers: Political and Social Bonds in Medieval Europe*, trans. Christopher Carroll (Cambridge, 2004).
- Althoff, Gerd, *Spielregeln der Politik im Mittelalter: Kommunikation in Frieden und Fehde* (Darmstadt, 1997).
- Ames, Christine Caldwell, *Medieval Heresies: Christianity, Judaism, and Islam* (Cambridge, 2015).
- Anatolios, Khaled, *Athanasius* (New York, 2004).
- Angenendt, Arnold, “Die Liturgie und die Organisation des kirchlichen Lebens auf dem Land,” in *Cristianizzazione ed organizzazione ecclesiastica delle campagne nell’ alto medioevo: espansione e resistenze*, *Settimane di Studio del Centro italiano di studi sull’alto medioevo* 28 (Spoleto, 1982), pp. 169–234.
- Appleby, David, “Spiritual Progress in Carolingian Saxony: A Case from Ninth-Century Corvey,” *Catholic Historical Review* 82 (1996), pp. 599–613.

- Arquillière, Henri-Xavier, *L'Augustinisme politique: Essai sur la formation des théories politiques au Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1934).
- Austin, John Langshaw, *How to Do Things with Words*, ed. J. Urmson and M. Sbisà, 2nd ed. (Harvard, 1975).
- Ayers, Lewis, "Articulating Identity," in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, ed. Frances Young, id. and Andrew Louth (Cambridge, 2004), pp. 200–21.
- Ayers, Lewis, *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford, 2004).
- Bachrach, David, "Confession in the Regnum Francorum (742–900): the sources revisited," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 54 (2003), pp. 3–22.
- Badian, Ernst, *Foreign Clientelae, 264–70 BC* (Oxford, 1958).
- Baetke, Walter, *Art und Glaube der Germanen* (Hamburg, 1934).
- Baetke, Walter, *Christentum und germanische Religion* (Berlin, 1934).
- Baetke, Walter, *Die Aufnahme des Christentums durch die Germanen. Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Germanisierung des Christentums* (Göttingen, 1944).
- Baix, François, "Les sources liturgiques de la *Vita Remigii* de Hincmar," in *Miscellanea historica in honorem Alberti de Meyer*, 2 vols. (Louvain, 1946), vol. I, pp. 211–27.
- Balmus, Constantin, *Études sur le style de saint Augustin dans les Confessions et la Cité de Dieu* (Paris, 1930).
- Banniard, Michel, "Vrais aveux et fausses confessions du IXe au XIe siècle vers une écriture autobiographique?" in *L'Aveu: Antiquité et Moyen-Âge. Actes de la table ronde organisée par l'École Française de Rome avec le concours du CNRS et de l'Université de Trieste*, Rome 28–30 mars 1984 (Rome, 1986), pp. 215–41.
- Banniard, Michel, *Viva voce: communication orale et communication écrite en occident latin (IVe–IXe siècle)* (Paris, 1992).
- Banniard, Michel, "Language and Communication in Carolingian Europe," in *NCMH*, pp. 695–709.
- Barthélemy, Dominique, "Présence de l'aveu dans le déroulement des ordalies (IXe–XIIIe siècle)," in *L'Aveu: Antiquité et Moyen Âge* (Rome, 1986), pp. 191–214.
- Barthélemy, Dominique, "Diversité des ordalies médiévales," *Revue historique* 280 (1988), pp. 3–26.
- Bartlett, Robert, *Trial by Fire and Water: The Medieval Judicial Ordeal* (Oxford, 1986).
- Bauer, Thomas, "Kontinuität und Wandel synodaler Praxis nach der Reichsteilung von Verdun: Versuch einer Typisierung und Einordnung der karolingischen Synoden und *concilia mixta* von 843 bis 870," *Annuaire Historiae Conciliorum* 23 (1991), pp. 11–115.
- Bauer, Thomas, "Wenilo, EB von Sens (837/837–865)," *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, vol. 13 (Herzberg, 2001), pp. 754–61.
- Bauer, Walter, *Rechtsgläubigkeit und Ketzerei in ältestem Christentum* (Tübingen, 1934).
- Becher, Matthias, *Eid und Herrschaft: Untersuchungen zum Herrscherethos Karls des Großen* (Sigmaringen, 1993).
- Becher, Matthias, "*Non enim habent regem idem Antiqui Saxones* . . . Verfassung und Ethnogenese in Sachsen während des 8. Jahrhunderts," *Studien zur Sachsenforschung* 12 (Oldenburg, 1999), pp. 1–31.
- Becker, Gustav Heinrich, *Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui* (Bonn, 1895).
- Benton, John, "Consciousness of Self and Perceptions of Individuality," in *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Robert Benson and Giles Constable (Harvard, 1982), pp. 263–98.
- Beumann, Helmut, "Unterwerfung und Christianisierung der Sachsen durch Karl der Grosse," in *Cristianizzazione ed organizzazione ecclesiastica delle campagne nell'alto*

- medioevo: espansione e resistenze, 10–16 aprile 1980, Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo* 28 (Spoleto, 1982), pp. 129–68.
- Birch, Debra, *Pilgrimage to Rome in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge, 1998).
- Bischoff, Bernhard, "Gottschalks Lied für den Reichenauer Freund," in id., *Mittelalterliche Studien. Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte*, vol. 2 (Stuttgart, 1967), pp. 26–34.
- Bischoff, Bernhard, "Irische Schreiber im Karolingerreich," in *Colloques internationaux du C.N.R.S. No 561—Jean Scot Érigène et l'histoire de la philosophie* (Paris, 1977), pp. 47–58; reprinted in id., *Mittelalterliche Studien*, vol. 3 (Stuttgart, 1981), pp. 39–54.
- Bischoff, Bernhard, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts* (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen), vols. I–II (Wiesbaden, 1998–2004).
- Bitel, Lisa, *Isle of the Saints: Monastic Settlement and Christian Community in Early Ireland* (Ithaca, 1990), pp. 222–34.
- Black, Jonathan, "Psalm Uses in Carolingian Prayerbooks: Alcuin and the Preface to the *De psalmorum usu*," *Medieval Studies* 64 (2002), pp. 1–60.
- Black, Jonathan, "Psalm Uses in Carolingian Prayerbooks: Alcuin's *Confessio Peccatorum Pura* and the Seven Penitential Psalms," *Medieval Studies* 65 (2003), pp. 1–56.
- Blaise, Albert, *Le vocabulaire latin des principaux thèmes liturgiques*, rev. Antoine Dumas (Turnhout, 1966).
- Bloch, Marc, *Feudal Society*, trans. L.A. Manyon, 2 vols. (Chicago, 1961).
- Blume, Clemens, *Der Cursus Sancti Benedicti Nursini und die liturgischen Hymnen des VI–IX Jahrhunderts in ihrer Beziehung zu den Sonntags- und -Ferialhymnen unseres Breviars* (Leipzig, 1908).
- Blumenshine, Gary, "Alcuin's *Liber Contra Haeresim Felicis* and the Frankish Kingdom," *Frühmittelalterlichen Studien* 17 (1983), pp. 222–33.
- Boller, Bernard, *Gottschalk d'Orbais de Fulda à Hautvillers: une dissidence* (Paris, 2004).
- Borrasch, Victor, *Der Mönch Gottschalk von Orbais. Sein Leben und seine Lehre* (Thorn, 1868).
- Boshof, Egon, *Ludwig der Fromme* (Darmstadt, 1996).
- Bostock, John Knight, *A Handbook on Old High German Literature*, rev. ed. (Oxford, 1976).
- Bouhot, Jean-Paul, *Ratramne de Corbie: histoire littéraire et controverses doctrinales* (Paris, 1976).
- Boulhol, Pascal, *Claude de Turin, un évêque iconoclaste dans l'occident carolingien. Étude suivie de l'édition du Commentaire sur Josué* (Paris, 2002).
- Bouyer, Louis, see: Jean Leclercq.
- Brown, Elizabeth, "The Tyranny of a Construct: Feudalism and Historians of Medieval Europe," *American Historical Review* 79 (1974), pp. 1063–88.
- Brown, Giles, "The Carolingian Renaissance," in *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 1–51.
- Brown, Peter, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography*, new ed. (Berkeley, 2000).
- Brown, Peter, *The Cult of Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (Chicago, 1981).
- Brown, Virginia, "Palimpsested Texts in Beneventan Script: A Handlist with Some Identifications," in *Early Medieval Palimpsests*, ed. Georges Declercq (Turnhout, 2007), pp. 99–144.
- Brown, Warren, "Conflict, Letters, and Personal Relationships in the Carolingian Formula Collections," *Law and History Review* 25 (2007), pp. 323–44.
- Bruce, Scott, *Silence and Sign Language in Medieval Monasticism: The Chuniac Tradition, c. 900–1200* (Cambridge, 2007).

- Brundage, James, *Law, Sex, and Christian Society in Medieval Europe* (Chicago, 1987).
- Brunhölzl, Franz, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, vol. I (Munich, 1975).
- Brunner, Heinrich, *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. II (Munich, 1928).
- Brunner, Karl, *Oppositionelle Gruppen im Karolingerreich* (Vienna, 1979).
- Brunt, Peter, *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays* (Oxford, 1988).
- Buc, Philippe, *The Dangers of Ritual: Between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory* (Princeton, 2001).
- Buc, Philippe, "The Monster and the Critics: A Ritual Reply," *EME* 15 (2007), pp. 441–52.
- Bujnoch, Josef, *Zwischen Rom und Byzanz: Leben und Wirken der Slavenapostel Kyrillos und Methodios nach den Pannonischen Lebenden und der Klemensvita* (Vienna, 1977).
- Bullough, Donald, "Alcuin and the Kingdom of Heaven: Liturgy, Theology and the Carolingian Age," in *Carolingian Essays*, ed. Ute-Renate Blumental (Washington, DC: 1983), pp. 1–69, reprinted: id., *Carolingian*, pp. 161–240.
- Bullough, Donald, "Aula Renovata: the Carolingian Court before the Aachen Palace," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 71 (1985), pp. 267–301.
- Bullough, Donald, *Carolingian Renewal: Sources and Heritage* (Manchester, 1991).
- Bullough, Donald, "Roman books and Carolingian renovatio," in id., *Carolingian*, pp. 123–60.
- Bullough, Donald, "The Carolingian Liturgical Experience," in *Continuity and Change in Christian Worship*, ed. R.N. Swanson, *Studies in Church History* 35 (Rochester, 1999), pp. 29–64.
- Bullough, Donald, *Alcuin: Achievement and Reputation* (Leiden, 2002).
- Burns, James Patout, "Grace," in *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Allan Fitzgerald et al. (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 391–8.
- Burton, Philip, *Language in the Confessions of Augustine* (Oxford, 2007).
- Bynum, Caroline Walker, "Did the Twelfth Century Discover the Individual?" *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 31 (1980), pp. 1–17.
- Cabaniss, Allen, "The Heresiarch Felix," *Catholic Historical Review* 39 (1953), pp. 129–41.
- Cabaniss, Allen, *Amalaricus of Metz* (Amsterdam, 1954).
- Callam, Daniel, "Clerical Continence in the Fourth Century," *Theological Studies* 41 (1980), pp. 3–50.
- Cappuyns, Maïeul, "Le premier représentant de l'augustinisme médiéval, Prosper d'Aquitaine," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 1 (1929), pp. 309–37.
- Cappuyns, Maïeul, *Jean Scot Érigène: sa vie, son œuvre, sa pensée* (Brussels, 1969).
- Carey, Frederick, "The Scriptorium of Rheims during the Archbishopric of Hincmar, 845–882 A.D.," in *Classical and Medieval Studies in Honor of Edward Kennard Rand*, ed. Leslie Webber Jones (New York, 1938), pp. 41–60.
- Carroll, Christopher, "The Bishoprics of Saxony in the First Century after Christianization," *EME* 8 (1999), pp. 219–45.
- Castelli, Elizabeth, *Martyrdom and Memory: Early Christian Culture Making* (New York, 2007).
- Cavadini, John, "The Sources and Theology of Alcuin's *De Fide Sanctae et Individuae Trinitatis*," *Traditio* 46 (1991), pp. 123–43.
- Cavadini, John, *The Last Christology of the West: Adoptionism in Spain and Gaul, 785–820* (Philadelphia, 1993).
- Cavadini, John, "A Carolingian Hilary," in *The Study of the Bible in the Carolingian Era*, ed. Celia Chazelle and Burton van Name Edwards (Turnhout, 2003), pp. 133–40.
- Cellot, Louis, *Historia Gotteschalchi praedestinatiani* (Paris, 1655).

- Charlemagne's Heir: New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814–840)*, ed. Peter Godman and Roger Collins (Oxford, 1990).
- Charles the Bald: Court and Kingdom*, ed. Margaret Gibson and Janet Nelson, 2nd ed. (Aldershot, 1990).
- Chazelle, Celia, “‘Not in Painting but in Writing’: Augustine and the Supremacy of the Word in the *Libri Carolini*,” in *Reading and Wisdom: The “De Doctrina Christiana” of Augustine in the Middle Ages*, ed. E.D. English (Notre Dame, 1995), pp. 1–22.
- Chazelle, Celia, “Archbishops Ebbo and Hincmar of Reims and the Utrecht Psalter,” *Speculum* 72 (1997), pp. 1055–77.
- Chazelle, Celia, *The Crucified God in the Carolingian Era* (Cambridge, 2002).
- Chazelle, Celia, “Exegesis in the Ninth-Century Eucharist Controversy,” in *The Study of the Bible in the Carolingian Era*, ed. ead. and Burton Van Name Edwards (Turnhout, 2003), pp. 167–87.
- Chazelle, Celia, and Burton van Name Edwards, “Introduction: The Study of the Bible and Carolingian Culture,” in *The Study of the Bible in the Carolingian Era*, ed. ead. and id. (Turnhout, 2003), pp. 1–18.
- Chisolm, John Edward, *The Pseudo-Augustinian Hypomnesticon Against the Pelagians and Celestians* (Fribourg, 1967).
- Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth Century*, ed. Bernard McGinn, John Meyendorff, and Jean Leclercq (New York, 1992).
- Chronologisches Wörterbuch des deutschen Wortschatzes, Zweiter Band: Der Wortschatz des 9. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Elmar Seebold et al. (Berlin, 2008).
- Clanchy, Michael, *Abelard: A Medieval Life* (Oxford, 1997).
- Claussen, Martin, “God and Man in Dhuoda’s *Liber manualis*,” in *Women in the Church*, ed. W.J. Sheils and Diana Wood, *Studies in Church History* 27 (Oxford, 1990), pp. 43–52.
- Claussen, Martin, *The Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the Regula canonorum in the Eighth Century* (Cambridge, 2004).
- Colish, Marcia, “Carolingian Debates over *Nihil* and *Tenebrae*: A Study of Theological Method,” *Speculum* 59 (1984), pp. 757–95.
- Collins, Roger, “Pippin I and the Kingdom of Aquitaine,” in *CH*, pp. 363–89.
- Consolino, Franca Ela, “L’invenzione di una biografia: Almanno di Hautvillers e la vita di sant’Elena,” *Hagiographica: Rivista di agiografica e biografia della Società internazionale per lo studio del Medio Evo latino* 1 (1994), pp. 81–100.
- Constable, Giles, *Letters and Letter-Collections* (Turnhout, 1976).
- The Construction of Communities in the Early Middle Ages: Texts, Resources and Artifacts*, ed. Richard Corradini, Max Diesenberger, and Helmut Reimitz (Leiden, 2003).
- Contreni, John, “Carolingian Biblical Studies,” in *Carolingian Essays: Patristics and Early Medieval Thought: Andrew W. Mellon Lectures in Early Christian Studies*, ed. Uta-Renate Blumenthal (Washington, DC; 1983), pp. 71–98, reprinted in: id., *Carolingian*, pp. 71–98.
- Contreni, John, *Carolingian Learning, Masters and Manuscripts* (Aldershot, 1992).
- Contreni, John, “The Carolingian Renaissance: Education and Literary Culture,” in *NCMH*, pp. 709–57.
- Contreni, John, “The Pursuit of Knowledge in the Carolingian World,” in *“The Gentle Voices of Teachers”: Aspects of Learning in the Carolingian Age*, ed. Richard Sullivan (Columbus, OH: 1995), pp. 106–41.
- Contreni, John, “Carolingian Biblical Culture,” in *Iohannis Scottus Eriugena: The Bible and Hermeneutics*, ed. C. Steel, J. McEvoy, and G. Van Riel (Leuven, 1996), pp. 1–23.

- Contreni, John, "Carolingian Era, Early," in *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopaedia*, ed. Allan Fitzgerald et al. (Grand Rapids, MI: 1999), pp. 124–9.
- Coon, Lynda, *Dark Age Bodies: Gender and Monastic Practice in the Early Medieval West* (Philadelphia, 2011).
- Cooper, Kate, *The Fall of the Roman Household* (Cambridge, 2007).
- Corradini, Richard, *Die Wiener Handschrift Cvp 430*. Ein Beitrag zur Historiographie in Fulda im frühen 9. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt am Main, 2000).
- Courcelle, Pierre, *Recherches sur les Confessions de saint Augustin* (Paris, 1950).
- Courcelle, Pierre, *Confessions dans le tradition littéraire: Antecedents et potérité* (Paris, 1963).
- Cruz, Adolfo Etchegaray, "L'enarratio Augustinienne sur le Ps. 50 et O Deus, miseri de Gottschalk d'Orbais," in *Studia Patristica, XVII. Papers of the Eighth International Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford, 3–8 September 1979*, ed. Elizabeth A. Livingstone, vol. 3 (Oxford, 1982), pp. 1245–50.
- Crouse, Robert, "Predestination, Human Freedom and Augustinian Theology of History in Eriugena's *De Divina Praedestinatione*," in *History and Eschatology in John Scot Eriugena and his Time*, ed. James McEvoy and Michael Dunne, (Leuven, 2002), pp. 303–11.
- Curta, Florin, *Southeastern Europe in the Middle Ages, 500–1250* (Cambridge, 2006).
- Cuscito, Guiseppe, "Aquileia e la cristianizzazione degli slavi nei secoli VIII–IX. Un problema storiografico," *Atti e memorie della Società istriana di archeologia e storia patria* 36 n.s. (1988), pp. 37–75.
- Dallen, James, "The Absence of a Ritual of Reconciliation in Celtic Penance," in *The Journey of Western Spirituality*, ed. A.W. Sadler (Chico, CA: 1981), pp. 79–106.
- Davis, Jennifer, *Charlemagne's Practice of Empire* (Cambridge, 2015).
- Davis, Leo, "Hincmar of Reims as Theologian of the Trinity," *Traditio* 27 (1971), pp. 455–68.
- DeGregorio, Scott, "Texts, *Topoi* and the Self: a Reading of Alfredian Spirituality," *EME* 13 (2005), pp. 79–96.
- de Jong, Mayke, "Growing up in a Carolingian Monastery: Magister Hildemar and his Oblates," *Journal of Medieval History* 9 (1983), pp. 99–128.
- de Jong, Mayke, "To the Limits of Kinship: Anti-Incest Legislation in the Early Medieval West (500–900)," in *From Sappho to De Sade: Moments in the history of sexuality*, ed. Jan Bremmer (London, 1989), pp. 36–59.
- de Jong, Mayke, "Power and Humility in Carolingian Society: The Public Penance of Louis the Pious," *EME* 1 (1992), pp. 29–52.
- de Jong, Mayke, "Carolingian Monasticism: the Power of Prayer," in *NCMH*, pp. 622–53.
- de Jong, Mayke, "Old Law and New-Found Power: Hrabanus Maurus and the Old Testament," in *Centres of Learning: Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East*, ed. Jan Willem Drijvers and Alasdair MacDonald (Leiden, 1995), pp. 161–76.
- de Jong, Mayke, *In Samuel's Image: Child Oblation in the Early Medieval West* (Leiden, 1996).
- de Jong, Mayke, "What was Public about Public Penance? *Paenitentia Publica* and Justice in the Carolingian World," in *La Giustizia nell'alto medioevo, Settimane di Studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo* 43 (1996), pp. 863–902.
- de Jong, Mayke, "Introduction—Rethinking Early Medieval Christianity: A View from the Netherlands," *EME* 7 (1998), pp. 261–75.
- de Jong, Mayke, "Pollution, Penance and Sanctity: Ekkehard's *Life of Iso of St. Gall*," in *The Community, the Family and the Saint: Patterns of Power in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. Joyce Hill and Mary Swan (Turnhout, 1998), pp. 145–58.
- de Jong, Mayke, "Religion," in *The Short Oxford History of Europe: The Early Middle Ages*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Oxford, 2001), pp. 131–64.

- de Jong, Mayke, "Charlemagne's Church," in *Charlemagne: Empire and Society*, ed. Joanna Story (New York, 2005), pp. 103–35.
- de Jong, Mayke, "Ecclesia and the Early Medieval Polity," in *Staat im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Stuart Airlie, Walter Pohl, and Helmut Reimitz (Vienna, 2006), pp. 113–32.
- de Jong, Mayke, *The Penitential State: Authority and Atonement in the Reign of Louis the Pious* (Cambridge, 2009).
- Dekkers, Eligius, "Sur la diffusion au Moyen Age des œuvres moins connues de saint Augustin," *Homo spiritualis: Festgabe für Luc Verheijen OSA zu seinem 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Cornelius Mayer and Karl Heinz Chelius (Würzburg, 1987), pp. 446–59.
- Dekkers, Eligius, "Quelques notes sur des florilèges augustinieniens anciens et médiévaux," *Augustiniana* 40–1 (1990), pp. 24–44.
- Dekkers, Eligius, and Aemilius Gaar, *Clavis Patrum Latinorum* (Steenbrugis, 1995).
- Delehaye, Hippolyte, *Études sur légendier romain* (Brussels, 1936).
- de Meyier, Karel Adriaan, *Codices Vossiani Latini*, vol. 2 (Leiden, 1975).
- de Nie, Giselle, "'Contagium' and Images of Self in Late Sixth-Century Gaul," in *Purity and Holiness: The Heritage of Leviticus*, ed. Marcel Poorthuis and Joshua Schwartz (Leiden, 2000), pp. 247–61.
- de Plinval, Georges, *Essai sur le style et la langue de Pélagie, suivi du traité inédit. De induratione cordis Pharaonis* (Friburg, 1947).
- de Plinval, Georges, "Prosper d'Aquitaine interprète de saint Augustin," *Revue des études augustinieniens* 1 (1958), pp. 339–55.
- Depreux, Philippe, "Imbuendis ad fidem prefulgidum surrexit lumen gentibus: La dévotion à saint Remi de Reims aux IX^e and X^e siècle," *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 35 (1992), pp. 111–29.
- Depreux, Philippe, *Prosopographie de l'entourage de Louis le Pieux (781–840)* (Sigmaringen, 1997).
- de Sainte-Marthe, Denis, *Gallia christiana*, vol. 4 (Paris, 1876).
- Deshman, Robert, "The Exalted Servant: the Ruler Theology of the Prayerbook of Charles the Bald," *Viator* 11 (1980), pp. 385–417.
- Devisse, Jean, *Hincmar: Archevêque de Reims, 845–882*, 3 vols. (Geneva, 1975).
- Diem, Albrecht, "Een verstoorder van de ordo: Gottschalk van Orbais en zijn leer van de dubbele predestinatie," *Utrechtse historische cahiers* 16 (1995), pp. 115–31.
- Diem, Albrecht, *Das monastische Experiment* (Münster, 2004).
- Diesner, Hans-Joachim, *Fulgentius von Ruspe als Theologe und Kirchenpolitiker* (Stuttgart, 1966).
- Dietz, Maribel, *Wandering Monks, Virgins, and Pilgrims: Ascetic Travel in the Mediterranean World, A.D. 300–800* (University Park, PA: 2005).
- Dinkler, Erich, *Gottschalk der Sachse. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach Germanentum und Christentum* (Berlin, 1936).
- Dittrich, Zdenek Radslav, *Christianity in Greater Moravia* (Groningen, 1962).
- Dolbeau, François and Martin Heinzelman, "Listes de noms champenois et anglais provenant de Saint-Remi de Reims (IX^e–début XII^e siècle)," *Francia* 39 (2012), pp. 393–438.
- Döpmann, Hans-Dieter, "Die Annahme des Christentums bei den Slawen-Völkern Südosteuropas," *Études Balkaniques* 26 (1990), pp. 46–53.
- Dopsch, Heinz, "Zur Missionstätigkeit des Patriarchats Aquileia in Kärnten," *Studien zur Geschichte von Millstatt und Kärnten. Vorträge der Millstätter Symposien 1981–1995*, ed. Franz Nikolasch (Klagenfurt, 1997), pp. 11–29.
- Dörries, Hermann, "Gottschalk, ein christlicher Zeuge der deutschen Frühzeit," *Junge Kirche* 5 (1937), pp. 670–84.

- Dörries, Hermann, "Der Heliand als Missionspredigt," in id., *Wort und Stunde*, vol. II (Göttingen, 1969), pp. 259–76.
- Driscoll, Michael, "Penance in Transition: Popular Piety and Practice," in *Medieval Liturgy: A Book of Essays*, ed. Lizette Larson-Miller (New York, 1997), pp. 121–63.
- Driscoll, Michael, *Alcuin et la pénitence à l'époque carolingienne* (Münster, 1999).
- Duchesne, Louis, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule III: les provinces du nord et de l'est* (Paris, 1915).
- Duffy, Stephen, *The Dynamics of Grace: Perspectives in Theological Anthropology* (Collegeville, MN: 1993).
- Duft, Johannes, "Irische Handschriftsüberlieferung in St. Gallen," in *Die Iren und Europa im früherem Mittelalter*, ed. Heinz Löwe (Stuttgart, 1982), pp. 916–37.
- Duft, Johannes, and Peter Meyer, *Die irischen Miniaturen der Stiftsbibliothek St. Gallen* (Bern, 1953).
- Dümmler, Ernst, "Briefe und Verse des neunten Jahrhunderts," *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 13 (1888), pp. 345–50.
- Dumville, David, *Three Men in a Boat: Scribe, Language, and Culture in Viking-Age Europe* (Cambridge, 1997).
- Dutton, Paul, *The Politics of Dreaming in the Carolingian Empire* (Lincoln, NE: 1994).
- Dutton, Paul, *Charlemagne's Moustache and Other Cultural Clusters of a Dark Age* (New York, 2004).
- Du Dubout, Nicolas, *Histoire de l'abbaye d'Orbais* (Paris, 1890).
- Dvornik, Francis, *Byzantine Missions among the Slavs: Saints Constantine-Cyril and Methodius* (New Brunswick, NJ: 1970).
- Edmunds, Lowell, *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry* (Baltimore, 2001).
- Ehlen, Thomas, "Bilder des Exils—das Exil als Bild. Ästhetik und Bewältigung in lyrischen Texten," in *Exil, Fremdheit und Ausgrenzung im Mittelalter*, ed. Andreas Bihrer, Sven Limbeck, and Paul Gerhard Schmidt (Würzburg, 2000), pp. 151–232.
- Ehlers, Joachim, "Die Sachsenmission als heilsgeschichtliches Ereignis," in *Vita Religiosa im Mittelalter. Festschrift für Kaspar Elm zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Franz Felten and Nikolas Jaspert (Berlin, 1999), pp. 37–53.
- Elliger, Walter, *Gottes- und Schicksalsglauben im frühdeutschen Christentum* (Hamburg, 1935).
- Epperlein, Siegfried, *Herrschaft und Volk im karolingischen Imperium* (Berlin, 1969).
- Erl, Adalbert, "Der Ursprung der Gottesurteile," *Paideuma. Mitteilungen zur Kulturkunde* 2 (1941), pp. 44–65.
- Ewig, Eugen, "Das Bild Constantins des Grossen in den Ersten Jahrhunderten des abendländischen Mittelalters," in *Spätantikes und fränkisches Gallien. Gesammelte Schriften (1952–1973)*, ed. Hartmut Atsma, 2 vols. (Munich, 1979), vol. 1, pp. 72–113.
- Fälschung als Mittel der Politik? Pseudoisidor im Licht der neuen Forschung. Gedenkschrift für Klaus Zechiel-Eckes*, ed. Karl Ubl and Daniel Ziemann (Wiesbaden, 2015).
- Feldman, Erich, "Confessiones," *Augustinus-Lexikon*, ed. Cornelius Mayer, (Basel, 1986), pp. 1134–94.
- Ferguson, Everett, "Siricius (d. 399)," in *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, ed. id., vol. 2 (New York, 1999), p. 1064.
- Ferreiro, Alberto, "Sexual Depravity, Doctrinal Error, and Character Assassination in the Fourth Century: Jerome against the Priscillianists," *Studia Patristica* 28 (1993), pp. 28–38.
- Ferreiro, Alberto, "Simon Magus: The Patristic-Medieval Traditions and Historiography," *Apocrypha* 7 (1996), pp. 147–65.

- Fichtenau, Heinrich, "Zum Reliquienwesen im frühen Mittelalter," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 60 (1952), pp. 60–89.
- Fickermann, Norbert, "Wiedererkannte Dichtungen Gottschalks," *Revue Bénédictine* 44 (1932), pp. 314–21.
- Fiedrowicz, Michael, *Psalmus Vox Totius Christi. Studien auf Augustins "Enarrationes in Psalmos"* (Freiburg, 1997).
- Fine, John, *The Early Medieval Balkans. A Critical Survey from the Sixth to the Late Twelfth Century* (Ann Arbor, 1983).
- Fiske, Adele, "Alcuin and Mystical Friendship," *Studi Medievali* 3 (1961), pp. 551–75.
- Fiske, Adele, *Friends and Friendship in the Monastic Tradition* (Cuernavaca, MX: 1970).
- Flierman, Robert, "Gens perfida or populus Christianus? Saxon (In) Fidelity in Frankish Historical Writing," in *The Resources of the Past in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. Clemens Gantner, Rosamond McKitterick, and Sven Meeder (Cambridge, 2015), pp. 188–205.
- Flint, Valerie, *The Rise of Magic in the Early Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1991).
- Frakes, Jerold, *The Fate of Fortune in the Early Middle Ages* (Leiden, 1988).
- Frank, Georgia, *The Memory of the Eyes: Pilgrims to Living Saints in Christian Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 2000).
- Frantzen, Allen, "The Significance of the Frankish Penitentials," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 30 (1979), pp. 409–21.
- Faulkner, Thomas, *Law and Authority in the Early Middle Ages: The Frankish Leges in the Carolingian Period* (Cambridge, 2016).
- Frede, Hermann Josef, *Allateinische Paulus-Handschriften* (Freiburg, 1964).
- Freise, Eckhard, "Studien zum Einzugsbereich der Klostergemeinschaft von Fulda," in *Die Klostergemeinschaft von Fulda im früheren Mittelalter*, ed. Karl Schmidt, vol. II (Munich, 1978), pp. 1003–216.
- Freystedt, Albert, "Der Streit über die göttliche Trinität im 9. Jahrhundert," *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 41 (1898), pp. 392–401.
- Freystedt, Albert, "Studien zu Gottschalks Leben und Lehre," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 18 (1898), pp. 1–22, 161–82, and 529–45.
- Fried, Johannes, "Fulda in der Bildungs- und Geistesgeschichte des früheren Mittelalters," in *Kloster Fulda in der Welt der Karolinger und Ottonen*, ed. Gangolf Schrimpf (Frankfurt am Main, 1996), pp. 3–38.
- Froger, Jacques, "The Critical Edition of the Roman Gradual by the Monks of Solesmes," *Journal of the Plainsong and Medieval Music Society* 1 (1978), pp. 81–97.
- Fros, Henri, "Liste des translations et inventions de l'époque carolingienne," *Analecta Bollandiana* 104 (1986), pp. 427–9.
- Fulton, Rachel, *From Judgement to Passion: Devotion to Christ and the Virgin Mary, 800–1200* (Columbia, 2002).
- Gaar, Aemilius, see: Eligius Dekkers.
- Gaddis, Michael, *There is No Crime for Those Who Have Christ: Religious Violence in the Christian Roman Empire* (Berkeley, 2005).
- Gallia Christiana*, 16 vols. (Paris, 1715–1865).
- Galvao-Sobrinho, Carlos, "Embodied Theologies: Christian Identity and Violence in Alexandria in the Early Arian Controversy," in *Violence in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Practices*, ed. Hale Drake (Burlington, VT: 2006), pp. 321–31.
- Galvao-Sobrinho, Carlos, *Doctrine and Power: Theological Controversy and Christian Leadership in the Later Roman Empire* (Berkeley, 2013).
- Ganshof, François, "Notes critiques sur les *Annales Bertiniani*," in *Mélanges F. Grat*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1949), pp. 159–74.

- Ganshof, François, *Feudalism*, trans. Philip Grierson (London, 1964).
- Ganz, David, review of Devisse, *Hincmar*, *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 57 (1979), pp. 711–18.
- Ganz, David, "The Debate on Predestination," in *CB*, pp. 283–302.
- Ganz, David, *Corbie in the Carolingian Renaissance* (Sigmaringen, 1990).
- Ganz, David, "The *Epitaphium Arsenii* and Opposition to Louis the Pious," in *CH*, pp. 537–50.
- Ganz, David, "Theology and the Organization of Thought," in *NCMH*, pp. 758–85.
- Ganz, David, and Monique Goullet, "Le Légendier de Turin et l'écriture *AB*," in *Le légendier de Turin. MS. D.V.3 de la Bibliothèque Nationale Universitaire*, ed. Monique Goullet with Sandra Isetta (Florence, 2014), pp. 75–91.
- Garrison, Mary, "The Emergence of Carolingian Latin Literature and the Court of Charlemagne (780–814)," in *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 111–40.
- Garrison, Mary, "The Social World of Alcuin: Nicknames at York and at the Carolingian Court," in *Alcuin of York: Scholar at the Carolingian Court (Proceedings of the Third Germania Latina Conference)*, ed. L.A.J.R. Houwen and Alasdair Andrew MacDonald (Groningen, 1995), pp. 59–79.
- Garrison, Mary, "The English and the Irish at the Court of Charlemagne," in *Karl der Grosse und sein Nachwirken: Charlemagne and his Heritage*, ed. P.L. Butzer, M. Kerner, and W. Oberschelp (Turnhout, 1997), pp. 97–123.
- Garrison, Mary, "Send More Socks: On Mentality and the Preservation Context of Early Medieval Letters," in *New Approaches to Medieval Communication*, ed. Marco Mostert (Turnhout 1999), pp. 69–100.
- Garrison, Mary, "The Franks as the New Israel?" in *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Yitzhak Hen and Matthew Innes (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 114–61.
- Garrison, Mary, "The Study of Emotions in Early Medieval History: Some Starting Points," *EME* 10 (2001), pp. 243–50.
- Garrison, Mary, "Les correspondants d'Alcuin," in *Actes du colloque "Alcuin à Tours,"* ed. Philip Depreux and Bruno Judic, *Annales de Bretagne et des pays de l'Ouest* 111 (2004), pp. 319–32.
- Garrison, Mary, "*Praesagum nomen tibi*: The Significance of Name-Wordplay in Alcuin's Letters to Arn," in *Erzbischof Arn von Salzburg*, ed. Meta Niederkorn-Bruck and Anton Scharer (Vienna, 2004), pp. 107–27.
- Garrison, Mary, "The Search for the Self? Tuus Albinus, Alcuin: Peevish Egotist or Parrhesiast?" in *ET*, pp. 137–52.
- Geary, Patrick, "Ethnic Identity as a Situational Construct in the Early Middle Ages," *Mitteilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 113 (1983), pp. 15–26.
- Geary, Patrick, *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, NY: 1994).
- Geary, Patrick, *Phantoms of Remembrance: Memory and Oblivion at the End of the First Millennium* (Princeton, 1994).
- Geary, Patrick, *The Myth of Nations: The Medieval Origins of Europe* (New York, 2002).
- Gehl, Paul, "Competens Silentium: Varieties of Monastic Silence in the Medieval West," *Viator* 18 (1987), pp. 125–60.
- Gelzer, Matthias, *The Roman Nobility*, trans. Robin Seager (Oxford, 1969).
- Gerlich, Alois, "Die Reichspolitik des Erzbischofs Otgar von Mainz," *Rheinische Vierteljahrsblätter* 19 (1954), pp. 286–313.
- Geuenich, Dieter, "Zur althochdeutschen Literature aus Fulda," in *Von der Klosterbibliothek zur Landesbibliothek: Beiträge zum zweihundertjährigen Bestehen der Hessische Landesbibliothek Fulda*, ed. Artur Brall (Stuttgart, 1978), pp. 99–124.

- Geuenich, Dieter, "A Survey of the Early Medieval Confraternity Books from the Continent," in *The Durham Liber Vitae and its Context*, ed. David Rollason, A.J. Piper, Margaret Harvey, and Lynda Rollason (Woodbridge, UK: 2004), pp. 141–7.
- Godman, Peter, *Poets and Emperors: Frankish Politics and Carolingian Poetry* (Oxford, 1987).
- Goetting, Hans, *Das Bistum Hildesheim 3: Die Hildesheimer Bischöfe von 815 bis 1221 (1227)* (Berlin, 1984).
- Goetz, Hans-Werner, "Social and Military Institutions," in *NCMH*, pp. 451–80.
- Goldberg, Eric, "Popular Revolt, Dynastic Politics, and Aristocratic Factionalism in the Early Middle Ages: the Saxon *Stellinga* Reconsidered," *Speculum* 70 (1995), pp. 476–501.
- Goldberg, Eric, "'More Devoted to the Equipment of Battle Than the Splendor of Banquets': Frontier Kingship, Martial Ritual, and Early Knighthood at the Court of Louis the German," *Viator* 30 (1999), pp. 41–78.
- Goldberg, Eric, *Struggle for Empire: Kingship and Conflict under Louis the German, 817–76* (Cornell, 2006).
- Gorman, Michael, "A Survey of the Oldest Manuscripts of St. Augustine's *De civitate Dei*," *The Journal of Theological Studies* 33 (1982), pp. 398–410, and reprinted in id., *Manuscript Traditions*, pp. 178–90.
- Gorman, Michael, "The Early Manuscript Tradition of St. Augustine's *Confessiones*," *Journal of Theological Studies* 34 (1983), pp. 114–45.
- Gorman, Michael, "Aurelius Augustinus: The Testimony of the Oldest Manuscripts of St. Augustine's works," *The Journal of Theological Studies* 35 (1984), pp. 475–80, reprinted in id., *Manuscript Traditions*, pp. 259–64.
- Gorman, Michael, "The Manuscript Traditions of St. Augustine's Major Works," in *Atti del Congresso internazionale su S. Agostino nel XVI Centenario della Conversione, Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 24, ed. Vittorino Grossi (Rome, 1987), pp. 381–412, reprinted in id., *Manuscript Traditions*, pp. 315–48.
- Gorman, Michael, *The Manuscript Traditions of the Works of St. Augustine* (Florence, 2001).
- Gottlieb, Theodor, "Randbemerkungen des Codex Bernensis 363," *Wiener Studien* 9 (1887), pp. 151–9.
- Goullet, Monique, see: Ganz, David.
- Grabert, Herbert, "Ein Mönch wider Kloster und Kirche," *Nationalsozialistische Monatshefte* 8 (1937), pp. 607–28.
- Grig, Lucy, *Making Martyrs in Late Antiquity* (Norfolk, 2004).
- Grillmeier, Alois, "Patristische Vorbilder frühcholastischer Systematik. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Augustinismus," *Studia Patristica* 6 (1962), pp. 390–408.
- Haarländer, Stephanie, *Hrabanus Maurus zum Kennenlernen. Ein Lesebuch mit einer Einführung in sein Leben und Werk* (Mainz, 2006).
- Haas, Christopher, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict* (Baltimore, 1997).
- Hagen, Hermann, *Catalogus codicum Bernensium* (Bibliotheca Bongarsiana) (Bern, 1875).
- Hagen, Hermann, *Codex Bernensis 363, phototypice editus* (Leiden, 1897).
- Hamilton, Sarah, *The Practice of Penance, 900–1050* (Woodbridge, UK: 2001).
- Hamman, Adalbert, "The Writers of Gaul," in *Patrology: The Golden Age of Latin Patristic Literature*, ed. Angelo di Berardino, trans. Placid Solari (Westminster, MD: 1986), pp. 504–62.
- Harnack, Adolph, *The History of Dogma*, trans. James Millar, 3rd rev. ed. (London, 1898).
- Hartmann, Wilfried, "Die Mainzer Synoden des Hrabanus Maurus," in *Hrabanus Maurus: Lehrer, Abt und Bischof*, ed. Raymond Kottje and Harald Zimmermann (Wiesbaden, 1982), pp. 130–44.

- Hartmann, Wilfried, *Die Synoden der Karolingerzeit im Frankenreich und in Italien* (Paderborn, 1989).
- Harvey, Susan Ashbrook, "Nestorius," in *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, ed. Everett Ferguson, 2nd ed., vol. 2 (New York, 1997), pp. 809–10.
- Haubrichs, Wolfgang, "Die Praefatio des Heliand: Ein Zeugnis der Religions- und Bildungspolitik Ludwigs des Deutschen," *Niederdeutsches Jahrbuch* 89 (1966), pp. 7–32.
- Haubrichs, Wolfgang, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn der Neuzeit. Die Anfänge: Versuche volkssprachiger Schriftlichkeit im frühen Mittelalter (ca. 700–1050/60)* (Frankfurt am Main, 1988).
- Hauck, Karl, "Die fränkische-deutsche Monarchie und der Weserraum," in *Die Eingliederung der Sachsen in das Frankenreich*, ed. Walther Lammers (Darmstadt, 1970), pp. 416–50.
- Hauer, Wilhelm, "Der nordische Geist im frühchristlichen Mittelalter. I. Gottschalk der Sachse," *Deutscher Glaube* 4 (1937), pp. 232–44.
- Haverfield, Francis, "Tacitus during the Late Roman Period and the Middle Ages," *Journal of Roman Studies* 6 (1915), pp. 196–200.
- Hayward, Paul, "Before the Coming of Popular Heresy: The Rhetoric of Heresy in English Historiography, c. 700–1154," in *Heresy in Transition: Transforming Ideas of Heresy in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. John Christian Laursen, Ian Hunter, and Cary Niderman (Aldershot, 2005), pp. 9–27.
- Head, Thomas, *Hagiography and the Cult of Saints: The Diocese of Orléans, 800–1200* (Cambridge, 1990).
- Heil, Wilhelm, "Der Adoptionismus, Alcuin, und Spanien," in *Karl der Grosse: Lebenswerke und Nachleben*, ed. Bernhard Bischoff, vol. 2 (Düsseldorf, 1965), pp. 94–155.
- Heinzelmann, Martin, *Translationsberichte und andere Quellen des Reliquien Kultes* (Turnhout, 1979).
- Heinzelmann, Martin, "Eucherius von Lyons," in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, vol. 4 (Munich, 1989), pp. 70–1.
- Heinzelmann, Martin, see also Dolbeau, François.
- Hen, Yitzhak, *Culture and Religion in Merovingian Gaul, A.D. 481–751* (New York, 1995).
- Hen, Yitzhak, *The Royal Patronage of Liturgy in Frankish Gaul to the Death of Charles the Bald (877)* (London, 2001).
- Henry, Nathalie, "The Song of Songs and the Liturgy of the *Velatio* in the Fourth Century: From Literary Metaphor to Liturgical Reality," *Studies in Church History* 35 (1999), pp. 18–28.
- Herdling, Otto, "Über die Dichtungen Gottschalks von Fulda," in *Festschrift Paul Kluckhohn und Hermann Schneider gewidmet zu ihrem 60. Geburtstag* (Tübingen, 1948), pp. 46–72.
- Herren, Michael, "St. Gall 48: A Copy of Eriugena's Glossed Greek Gospels," in *Tradition und Wertung. Festschrift für Franz Brunhölzl*, ed. G. Bernt, F. Rädle, and G. Silagi (Sigmaringen, 1989), pp. 97–105.
- Hildebrandt, Madge, *The External School in Carolingian Society* (New York, 1992).
- Hillgarth, Jocelyn, "L'Influence de la 'Cité de Dieu' de saint Augustin au Haut Moyen Âge," *Sacris Erudiri* 28 (1985), pp. 5–34.
- Hinds, Stephen, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge, 1998).
- Hines, John, "The Conversion of the Old Saxons," in *The Continental Saxons from the Migration Period to the Tenth Century*, ed. David Green and Frank Siegmund (Rochester, NY: 2003), pp. 299–314.
- Hofstra, Tette, "A Note on the 'Darkness of the Night' Motif in Alliterative Poetry, and the Search for the Poet of the Old Saxon Heliand," in *Loyal Letters: Studies on Mediaeval Alliterative Poetry and Prose*, ed. Luuk Houwen and Alasdair MacDonald (Groningen, 1994), pp. 93–104.

- Holtkemper, Franz-Josef, "Kompilation und Originalität bei Hrabanus Maurus," in *Pädagogische Blätter. Heinrich Döpp-Vorwald zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. id. (Düsseldorf, 1967), pp. 58–75.
- Holtz, Louis, "La tradition ancienne du *Liber in partibus Donati* de Smaragde de Saint-Mihiel," *Revue d'histoire des textes* 16 (1986), pp. 171–211.
- Hrabanus Maurus: Lehrer, Abt und Bischof*, ed. Raymund Kottje and Harald Zimmermann (Mainz, 1992).
- Hughes, Kevin, *Constructing Antichrist: Paul, Biblical Commentary, and the Development of Doctrine in the Early Middle Ages* (Washington, DC: 2005).
- Huglo, Michel, "Observations codicologiques sur l'antiphonaire de Compiègne (Paris, B.N. lat. 17436)," in *De Musica et Cantu. Studien zur Geschichte der Kirchenmusik und der Oper. Helmut Huckle zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Peter Cahn and Ann-Katrin Heimer (Hildesheim, 1993), pp. 117–30.
- Hummer, Hans, "The Identity of Ludouicus piissimus Augustus in the *Praefatio in librum antiquum lingua Saxonica conscriptum*," *Francia* 31 (2004), pp. 1–14.
- Hummer, Hans, *Politics and Power in Early Medieval Europe: Alsace and the Frankish Realm, 600–1000* (Cambridge, 2006).
- Innes, Matthew, *State and Society in the Early Middle Ages: The Middle Rhine Valley, 400–1000* (Cambridge, 2000).
- Innes, Matthew, "Teutons or Trojans? The Carolingians and the Germanic Past," in *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. id. and Yitzhak Hen (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 227–49.
- Innes, Matthew, "'Immune from Heresy': Defining the Boundaries of Carolingian Christianity," in *Frankland: The Franks and the World of the Early Middle Ages. Essays in Honour of Dame Jinty Nelson*, ed. Paul Fouracre and David Ganz (New York, 2008), pp. 101–25.
- Inventer l'hérésie? Discours polémique et pouvoir avant l'Inquisition*, ed. Monique Zerner (Nice, 1998).
- Die Iren und Europa im früherem Mittelalter*, ed. Heinz Löwe, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1982).
- Isaïa, Marie-Céline, *Remi de Reims. Mémoire d'un saint, histoire d'une Église* (Paris, 2010).
- Italy in the Early Middle Ages 476–1000*, ed. Christina La Rocca (Oxford, 2002).
- Iversen, Gunilla, "Pax et Sapientia: A Thematic Study on Tropes from Different Traditions (Based primarily on Sanctus and Agnus Dei Tropes)," in *Pax et Sapientia: Studies in Text and Music of Liturgical Tropes and Sequences in Memory of Gordon Anderson*, ed. Ritva Jacobsson (Stockholm, 1986), pp. 23–58.
- Jacobsson, Riva, "The Antiphoner of Compiègne: Paris, BNF lat. 17436," in *The Divine Office in the Latin Middle Ages: Methodology and Source Studies, Regional Developments, Hagiography. Written in Honor of Professor Ruth Steiner*, ed. Margot Fassler and Rebecca Baltzer (Oxford, 2000), pp. 147–78.
- Jeanjean, Benoît, *Saint Jérôme et l'hérésie* (Paris, 1999).
- Jolivet, Jean, *Godescalc d'Orbais et la Trinité* (Paris, 1958).
- Jullian, L., "Le cycle de Rectarianus," *Revue des études anciennes* 25 (1923), pp. 367–78.
- Kadner, D., "Aus den neuentdeckten Traktaten des Mönches Gottschalk," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 61 (1942), pp. 348–58.
- Kagerah, Walter, *Gottschalk der Sachse* (Dissertation, Greifswald, 1938).
- Katzenellenbogen, Adolf, "The Image of Christ in the Early Middle Ages," in *Life and Thought in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Robert Hoyt (Minneapolis, 1967), pp. 66–84.
- Keefer, Sarah, "Ut in omnibus honorificetur Deus: the corsnæd ordeal in Anglo-Saxon England," in *The Community, the Family and the Saint: Patterns of Power in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. Joyce Hill and Mary Swan (Turnholt, 1998), pp. 237–64.
- Kelly, John, *Early Christian Creeds*, 3rd ed. (London, 1972).

- Kenney, James, *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland: Ecclesiastical* (New York, 1929).
- Kershaw, Paul, "Illness, Power and Prayer in Asser's *Life of King Alfred*," *EME* 10 (2001), pp. 201–24.
- Kershaw, Paul, "Eberhard of Friuli, a Carolingian Lay Intellectual," in *LI*, pp. 77–105.
- Kershaw, Paul, *Peaceful Kings: Peace, Power and the Early Medieval Political Imagination* (Oxford, 2011).
- Kindig, Robert, *Ideologie in der Frühscholastik. Eine ideologiekritische Untersuchung der Kontroverse um die gemina praedestinatio des Mönchs Gottschalk von Fulda* (Dissertation, Karl-Franzens-Universität, Graz, 2003).
- Knox, R. Buck, *James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh* (Cardiff, 1967).
- Kosto, Adam, "Hostages in the Carolingian World (714–840)," *EME* 11 (2002), pp. 123–47.
- Kottje, Raymond, *Die Bussbücher Haltigars von Cambrai und des Hrabanus Maurus: ihre Überlieferung und ihre Quellen* (Berlin, 1980).
- Kottje, Raymond, "Busspraxis und Bussritus," in *Segni e riti nella chiesa altomedievale occidentale, Settimane di Studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo* 33 (1987), pp. 369–95.
- Kottje, Raymond, "Kirchliches Recht und päpstlicher Autoritätsanspruch. Zu den Auseinandersetzungen über die Ehe Lothars II," in *Aus Kirche und Reich: Studien zu Theologie, Politik und Recht im Mittelalter. Festschrift für F. Kempf* (Sigmaringen, 1988), pp. 97–103.
- Kottje, Raymond, "Zu den Beziehungen zwischen Hinkmar von Reims und Hrabanus Maurus," in *CB*, pp. 235–40.
- Koziol, Geoffrey, *Begging Pardon and Favor: Ritual and Political Order in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca, NY: 1992).
- Koziol, Geoffrey, "The Danger of Polemic: Is Ritual Still an Interesting Topic of Historical Study?" *EME* 11 (2002), pp. 367–88.
- Krahwinkel, Harald, *Friaul im Frühmittelalter: Geschichte einer Region vom Ende des fünften bis zum Ende des zehnten Jahrhunderts* (Vienna, 1992).
- Krüger, Karl Heinrich, *Studien zur Corveyer Gründungsüberlieferung* (Münster, 2001), pp. 92–5.
- Lambot, Cyrille, "Opusculs grammaticaux de Gottschalk," *Revue Bénédictine* 44 (1932), pp. 120–4.
- Lanham, Carol Dana, "Freshman Composition in the Early Middle Ages: Epistolography and Rhetoric before the *Ars dictaminis*," *Viator* 23 (1992), pp. 115–34.
- La Rocca, Cristina, *Pacifico di Verona. Il passato carolingio nell costruzione della memoria urbana* (Rome, 1995).
- La Rocca, Cristina, and Luigi Provero, "The Dead and Their Gifts. The Will of Eberhard, Count of Friuli, and His Wife, Gisela, Daughter of Louis the Pious (863–864)," in *Rituals of Power from Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Janet Nelson and Frans Theuvs (Leiden, 2000), pp. 225–80.
- Lavaud, Benoît, "Précurseur de Calvin ou témoin de l'Augustinisme? Le cas de Gotescalc," *Revue Thomiste* 15 (1932), pp. 71–101.
- Law, Vivien, "Late Latin grammars in the earlier Middle Ages: a typological history," *Historiographia Linguistica* 13 (1986), pp. 365–80.
- Law, Vivien, "The Study of Grammar," in *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 88–110.
- Lawton, David, *Blasphemy* (Philadelphia, 1993).
- Le Boulluec, Alain, *La notion d'hérésie dans la littérature grecque IIe–IIIe siècles* (Paris, 1985).

- Leclercq, Jean, "Smaragde et la grammaire chrétienne," *Revue du moyen âge latin* 4 (1948), pp. 15–22.
- Leclercq, Jean, "Saint Antoine dans la tradition monastique médiévale," *Antonius Magnus Eremita, 356–1956: Studia ad antiquum monachismum spectantia*, ed. Basil Steidle (Rome, 1956), pp. 229–47.
- Leclercq, Jean, "'Militare Deo' dans la tradition patristique et monastique," in *Militia Christi e Crociata nei secoli XI–XIII: Atti della undecima Settimana internazionale di studio, Mendola, 28 agosto–1 settembre 1989* (Milan, 1992), pp. 3–20.
- Leclercq, Jean, François Vandenbroucke and Louis Bouyer, *The Spirituality of the Middle Ages*, trans. The Benedictines of Holme Eden Abbey, Carlisle (New York, 1982).
- Leitmaier, Charlotte, *Die Kirche und die Gottesurteile* (Vienna, 1953).
- Le Jan, Régine, "Le lien social entre Antiquité et haut Moyen Âge: l'amitié dans les collections de lettres gauloises," in *Akkulturation: Probleme einer germanisch-romanischen Kultursynthese in Spätantike und frühem Mittelalter*, ed. Dieter Hägermann, Wolfgang Haubrichs, and Jörg Jarnut (Berlin, 2004), pp. 528–46.
- Le Maître, Philippe, "Les méthodes exégétiques de Raban Maur," in *Haut Moyen Âge. Culture, éducation et société. Études offertes à Pierre Riché*, ed. Michel Sot (Nanterre, 1990), pp. 343–51.
- Levillain, Leon, "La conversion et le baptême de Clovis," *Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France* 21 (1935), pp. 161–92.
- Levy, Leonard, *Treason Against God: A History of the Offense of Blasphemy* (New York, 1981).
- Leyser, Conrad, *Authority and Asceticism from Augustine to Gregory the Great* (Oxford, 2000).
- Lifshitz, Felice, *The Name of the Saint: The Martyrology of Jerome and Access to the Sacred in Francia, 627–827* (Notre Dame, 2006).
- Loew, Elias Avery, *The Beneventan Script: A History of the South Italian Miniscule*, 2nd ed. prepared by Virginia Brown, 2 vols. (Rome, 1980).
- Löwe, Heinrich, "Cyrrill und Methodius zwischen Byzanz und Rom," *Settimane di studio del centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo* 30 (1983), pp. 631–86.
- Löwe, Heinz, "Lateinisch-christliche Kultur im karolingischen Sachsen," in *Religiosität und Bildung im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Tilman Struve (Weimar, 1994), pp. 46–86.
- Lück, Heiner, "Lex Saxonum," in *Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde*, ed. Johannes Hoops (Berlin, 2001), pp. 332–6.
- Ludwig der Deutsche und seine Zeit*, ed. Wilfried Hartmann (Darmstadt, 2004).
- Lyman, J. Rebecca, "A Topography of Heresy: Mapping the Rhetorical Creation of Arianism," in *Arianism after Arius: Essays on the Development of Fourth Century Trinitarian Conflict*, ed. Michel Barnes and Daniel Williams, (Edinburgh, 1993), pp. 45–62.
- Lynch, Joseph, *Godparents and Kinship in Early Medieval Europe* (Princeton, 1986).
- Lynch, Joseph, *Christianizing Kinship: Ritual Sponsorship in Anglo-Saxon England* (Ithaca, NY: 1998).
- Mabillon, Jean, *Annales ordinis sancti Benedicti*, vol. III (Paris, 1706).
- Mack, Burton, *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins* (Philadelphia, 1988).
- MacMullen, Ramsay, "The Historical Role of the Masses in Late Antiquity," in *Changes in the Roman Empire: Essays in the Ordinary*, ed. id. (Princeton, 1990), 250–76.
- MacMullen, Ramsay, "Cultural and Political Changes in the 4th and 5th Centuries," *Historia* 52 (2003), 465–95.
- MacMullen, Ramsay, *Voting about God in Early Church Councils* (Yale, 2006).
- Madec, Goulven, *Le Dieu d'Augustin* (Paris, 1998).
- Magnou-Nortier, Elisabeth, "L'Admonitio generalis: étude critique," in *Jornades Internacionals d'Estudi sobre el Bisbe Feliu d'Urgell, 28–30 de setembre de 1999. Crònica i estudis*, ed. Josep Perarnau (Barcelona, 2000), pp. 195–242.

- Mainoldi, Ernesto Sergio, "Una proposta di nuova attribuzione ad Almanno di Hautvillers," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Âge* 76 (2009), pp. 7–28.
- LeMaitre, Jean-Loup, *Répertoire des documents nécrologiques français*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1980).
- Manceaux, Jean Baptiste, *Histoire de l'abbaye et du village d'Hautvillers*, 3 vols. (Épernay, 1880).
- Manitius, Max, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, vol. I (Munich, 1911).
- Marenbon, John, "John Scottus and Carolingian Theology: From the *De Praedestinatione*, Its Background and Its Critics, to the *Periphyseon*," in *CB*, pp. 303–25.
- Markus, Robert, *Gregory the Great and his World* (Cambridge, 1997).
- Martin, Thomas, "Vox Pauli: Augustine and the Claims to Speak for Paul, An Exploration of Rhetoric at the Service of Exegesis," *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 8 (2000), pp. 237–72.
- Mathon, Gerard, "Pascase Radbert et l'évolution de l'humanisme carolingien," *Corbie, abbaye royale* 13 (1963), pp. 135–55.
- Mayr-Harting, Henry, *Two Conversions to Christianity: The Bulgarians and the Anglo-Saxons* (Reading, 1994).
- McCormick, Michael, "The Liturgy of War in the Early Middle Ages: Crises, Litanies and the Carolingian Monarchy," *Viator* 15 (1984), pp. 1–23.
- McCormick, Michael, *The Origins of the European Economy: Communications and Commerce, AD 300–900* (Cambridge, 2001).
- McCulloh, John, "Das Martyrologium Hrabans als Zeugnis seiner geistigen Arbeit," in *Hrabanus Maurus: Lehrer, Abt und Bischof*, ed. Raymund Kottje and Harald Zimmermann (Mainz, 1982), pp. 154–64.
- McGinn, Bernard, *The Antichrist: Two Thousand Years of the Human Fascination with Evil* (New York, 2000).
- McHugh, Michael, "Eucherius of Lyons," in *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, ed. Everett Ferguson, 2nd ed., vol. 1 (New York, 1997).
- McGuire, Patrick, *Friendship and Community. The Monastic Experience, 350–1250* (Kalamazoo, 1988).
- McKeon, Peter, "Archbishop Ebbo of Reims (81–835): A Study of the Carolingian Empire and Church," *Church History* 43 (1974), pp. 437–47.
- McKeon, Peter, "The Carolingian Councils of Savonnières (859) and Tusey (860) and their Background," *Revue Bénédictine* 84 (1974), pp. 75–110.
- McKitterick, Rosamond, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms, 789–895* (London, 1977).
- McKitterick, Rosamond, *The Carolingians and the Written Word* (Cambridge, 1989).
- McKitterick, Rosamond, *History and Memory in the Carolingian World* (Cambridge, 2004).
- McKitterick, Rosamond, *Perceptions of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (Notre Dame, 2006).
- McKitterick, Rosamond, *Charlemagne: The Formation of a European Identity* (Cambridge, 2008).
- McLaughlin, Megan, *Consorting with Saints: Prayer for the Dead in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca, NY: 1994).
- McNamara, Marie Aquinas, *Friendship in Saint Augustine* (Fribourg, 1958).
- Meens, Rob, "Pollution in the Early Middle Ages: The Case of the Food Regulations in Penitentials," *EME* 4 (1995), pp. 3–19.
- Meens, Rob, "The Frequency and Nature of Early Medieval Penance," in *Handling Sin. Confession in the Middle Ages*, ed. A.J. Minnis and Peter Biller (Woodbridge, 1998), pp. 35–61.

- Meens, Rob, "'A Relic of Superstition': Bodily Impurity and the Church from Gregory the Great to the Twelfth-Century Decretists," in *Purity and Holiness: The Heritage of Leviticus*, ed. Marcel Poorthuis and Joshua Schwartz (Leiden, 2000), pp. 281–93.
- Meyer, Peter, see: Johannes Duft.
- Meyers, Jean, *L'art de l'emprunt dans la poésie de Sedulius Scottus* (Paris, 1986).
- Miller, Eric, *The Politics of Imitating Christ: Christ the King and Christomimetic Rulership in Early Medieval Biblical Commentaries* (Dissertation, University of Virginia, 2001).
- Mitteis, Heinrich, *Lehnrecht und Staatsgewalt. Untersuchungen zur mittelalterlichen Verfassungsgeschichte* (Weimar, 1933).
- Mittelateinisches Wörterbuch bis zum ausgehenden 13. Jahrhundert*, ed. Otto Prinz et al. (Munich, 1967–).
- Mitterauer, Marie Christine, *Gottschalk der Sachse und seine Gegner im Prädestinationsstreit* (Dissertation, Vienna, 1956).
- Moore, Robert, "Heresy as Disease," in *The Concept of Heresy in the Middle Ages (11th–13th C.) Proceedings of the International Conference, Louvain May 13–16, 1973*, ed. Willem Lourdaux and D. Verhelst (Leuven, 1976), pp. 1–11.
- Moore, Robert, *The Formation of a Persecuting Society: Authority and Deviance in Western Europe, 950–1250*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 2007).
- Morin, Germain, "Le *Liber Dogmatum* de Gennade de Marseille et problèmes qui s'y rattachent," *Revue Bénédictine* 24 (1907), pp. 445–55.
- Morin, Germain, "Gottschalk retrouvé," *Revue Bénédictine* 43 (1931), pp. 303–12.
- Morris, Colin, *The Discovery of the Individual, 1050–1200* (London, 1972).
- Munier, Charles, "La profession de foi des *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* et les écrits de Gennade de Marseille," *Studia Patristica* 3 (1961), pp. 248–61.
- Murphy, Ronald, *The Saxon Savior: The Germanic Transformation of the Gospel in the Ninth-Century Heliand* (Oxford, 1989).
- Murray, Alexander, "Confession before 1215," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, ser. vi, 3 (1993), pp. 51–81.
- Mütherich, Florentine, see Schramm, Percy.
- Nash, David, *Blasphemy in the Christian World* (Oxford, 2007).
- Nees, Lawrence, *A Tainted Mantle: Hercules and the Classical Tradition at the Carolingian Court* (Philadelphia, 1991).
- Nelson, Janet, "Ritual and Reality in the Early Medieval Ordines," *Studies in Church History* 11 (1975), pp. 41–51.
- Nelson, Janet, "Inauguration Rituals," in *Early Medieval Kingship*, ed. Peter Sawyer and Ian Wood (Leeds, 1977), pp. 50–71.
- Nelson, Janet, "Carolingian Royal Ritual," in *Rituals of Royalty. Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*, ed. David Cannadine and Simon Price (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 137–80.
- Nelson, Janet, "Women and the Word," *Studies in Church History* 27 (1990), pp. 53–78.
- Nelson, Janet, "The 'Annals of St Bertin,'" in *CB*, pp. 23–40.
- Nelson, Janet, *Charles the Bald* (New York, 1992).
- Nelson, Janet, "The Voice of Charlemagne," in *Belief and Culture in the Middle Ages: Studies Presented to Henry Mayr-Harting* (Oxford, 2001), pp. 76–88.
- Nelson, Janet, "Not Bishops' Bailiffs but Lords of the Earth," in ead., *The Frankish World, 750–900* (London 2003), pp. 133–44.
- Nelson, Janet, "Charlemagne the Man," in *Charlemagne: Empire and Society*, ed. Joanna Story (Manchester, 2005), pp. 22–37.
- The New Cambridge Medieval History, c.700–c.900*, vol. II, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge 1995).

- Nineham, Dennis Eric, "Gottschalk of Orbais: Reactionary or Precursor of the Reformation?" *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 40 (1989), pp. 1–18.
- Noble, Thomas, "Lupus of Ferrières in his Carolingian Context," in *After Rome's Fall: Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History*, ed. Alexander Murray (Toronto, 1998), pp. 232–50.
- Noble, Thomas, "The Christian Church as an Institution," in *The Cambridge History of Christianity, Volume 3: Early Medieval Christianities c. 600–c. 1100*, ed. id. and Julia Smith (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 249–74.
- Noble, Thomas, "Secular Sanctity: Forging an Ethos for the Carolingian Nobility," in *LI*, pp. 8–36.
- Nottarp, Hermann, *Gottesurteilstudien* (Munich, 1956).
- Nuvolone-Nobile, Flavio, "Problèmes d'une nouvelle édition du *De Induratione Cordis Pharaonis* attribué à Pélagé," *Revue des études Augustiniennes* 26 (1980), pp. 105–17.
- Obolensky, Dimitri, *Byzantium and the Slavs* (London, 1971).
- O'Donnell, James, *Augustine: Confessions*, 3 vols. (Oxford, 1992).
- O'Donnell, James, *Augustine: A New Biography* (New York, 2005).
- Oexle, Otto Gerhard, "Memoria und Memorialüberlieferung im früheren Mittelalter," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 10 (1976), pp. 70–95.
- Ó Fiaich, Tomas, "Irish Peregrini on the Continent," *Irish Ecclesiastical Review* 103 (1965), pp. 233–40.
- O'Meara, James, *Eriugena* (Oxford, 1988).
- Önnerfors, Alf, "Walahfrid Strabo als Dichter," in *Die Abtei Reichenau. Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte und Kultur des Inselklosters*, ed. Helmut Maurer (Sigmaringen, 1974), pp. 83–114.
- Osborne, John, "Politics, Diplomacy and the Cult of Relics in Venice and the Northern Adriatic in the First Half of the Ninth Century," *EME* 8 (1999), pp. 369–86.
- Ostrogorsky, Georg, *Byzanz und die Welt der Slawen* (Darmstadt, 1974).
- Otten, Willemien, "The Texture of Tradition. The Role of the Church Fathers in Carolingian Theology," in *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West, From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, vol. I, ed. Irena Backus (Leiden, 1997), pp. 3–50.
- Oxford Latin Dictionary*, ed. P.G.W. Glare (Oxford, 1968–82).
- Palmer, James, "Rimbert's *Vita Anskarii* and the Scandinavian Mission in the Ninth Century," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 55 (2004), pp. 235–56.
- Palmer, James, "Defining Paganism in the Carolingian World," *EME* 15 (2007), pp. 402–25.
- Palmer, James, *The Apocalypse in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2014).
- Patzke, Hans, "Mission und Kirchenorganisation in karolinger Zeit," in *Geschichte Niedersachsens*, volume I, ed. id. (Hildesheim, 1985) pp. 653–712.
- Patzold, Steffen, "Konflikte im Kloster Fulda zur Zeit der Karolinger," *Fuldaer Geschichtsblätter* 76 (2000), pp. 69–162.
- Patzold, Steffen, *Episcopus. Wissen über Bischöfe im Frankenreich des späten 8. bis frühen 10. Jahrhunderts* (Ostfildern, 2008).
- Payer, Pierre, *Sex and the Penitentials* (Toronto, 1984).
- Peititmengin, Pierre, "D'Augustin à Prudence de Troyes: les citations augustiniennes dans un manuscrit d'auteur," in *De Tertullien aux Mozarabes, II: Antiquité tardive et Christianisme ancien (Vie–IXe siècles). Mélanges offerts à Jacques Fontaine*, ed. Louis Holtz and Jean-Claude Fredouille (Paris, 1992), pp. 229–51.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav, *The Christian Tradition. A History of the Development of Doctrine 1: The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100–600)* (Chicago, 1971).

- Pelikan, Jaroslav, *The Christian Tradition. A History of the Development of Doctrine 3: The Growth of Medieval Theology (600–1300)* (Chicago, 1978).
- Pelttari, Aaron, *The Space that Remains: Reading Latin Poetry in Late Antiquity* (Ithaca, 2014).
- Peltier, Henri, *Pascase Radbert* (Amiens, 1938).
- Pezé, Warren, “Autorité royale et controverses théologiques sous Charles le Chauve (840–877),” *Hypothèses, revue de l’école doctorale d’histoire de Paris 1* (2011), pp. 229–44.
- Pezé, Warren, “Amalaire et la communauté juive de Lyon: À propos de l’antijudaïsme lyonnais à l’époque carolingienne,” *Francia* 40 (2013), pp. 1–25.
- Pezé, Warren, “Primum in Italiam, deinde in Galliam: la correspondance autour du passage de Gottschalk d’Orbais en Italie (835–848),” in *La corrispondenza epistolare in Italia 2: forme, stili e funzioni della scrittura epistolare nelle cancellerie italiane (secoli V–XV)*, ed. Stéphane Gioanni and Paolo Cammarosano (Trieste, 2013), pp. 145–69.
- Pezé, Warren, “Hérésie, exclusion et anathème dans l’occident carolingien (742–années 860),” in *Exclure de la communauté chrétienne. Sens et pratiques sociales de l’anathème et de l’excommunication (IVe–XIIe siècle)*, ed. Geneviève Bührer-Thierry and Stéphane Gioanni (Turnhout, 2015), pp. 175–95.
- Philippart, Guy, “Les légendiers, des origines au début du ix^e siècle,” in *Le légendier de Turin. MS. D.V.3 de la Bibliothèque Nationale Universitaire*, ed. Monique Goulet with Sandra Isetta (Florence, 2014), pp. 7–74.
- Pohl, Walter, “Tradition, Ethnogenese und literarische Gestaltung: eine Zwischenbilanz,” in *Ethnogenese und Überlieferung. Angewandte Methoden der Frühmittelalterforschung*, ed. Karl Brunner and Brigitte Merta (Vienna, 1994), pp. 9–26.
- Pohl, Walter, “Ethnicity, Theory and Tradition: A Response,” in *On Barbarian Identity: Critical Approaches to Ethnogenesis Theory*, ed. Andrew Gillett (Turnholt, 2002), pp. 221–40.
- Pohl, Walter, *Die Germanen* (Munich, 2000).
- Pohl, Walter, *Die Völkerwanderung. Eroberung und Integration* (Berlin, 2002).
- Pohl, Walter, “Der Germanenbegriff vom 3. bis zum 8. Jahrhundert—Identifikationen und Abgrenzungen,” in *Zur Geschichte der Gleichung “germanisch-deutsch”: Sprache und Namen, Geschichte und Institutionen*, ed. Heinrich Beck, Dieter Geuenich, Heiko Steuer, and Dietrich Hakelberg (New York, 2004), pp. 163–84.
- Pohl, Walter, “Identität und Widerspruch. Gedanken zu einer Sinngeschichte des frühen Mittelalters,” in *Auf der Suche nach den Ursprüngen. Von der Bedeutung des frühen Mittelalters*, ed. id. (Vienna, 2004), pp. 23–36.
- Pohl, Walter, “Aux origines d’une Europe ethnique: Identités en transformation entre antiquité et moyen âge,” in *Annales Histoire, Sciences sociales* 1 (2005), pp. 183–208.
- Pohl, Walter, “Introduction: Ego Trouble?” in *ET*, pp. i–xix.
- Poirel, Dominique, “Un poème inédit d’Alamanne de Hautvillers,” *Revue d’histoire des textes* 24 (1994), pp. 275–90.
- Poulin, Joseph-Claude, *L’Idéal de sainteté dans l’Aquitaine carolingienne d’après les sources hagiographiques (750–950)* (Quebec City, 1975).
- Poulin, Joseph-Claude, “Geneviève, Clovis et Remi: entre politique et religion,” in *Clovis—histoire et mémoire. Le baptême de Clovis, l’événement: Actes du Colloque international d’histoire de Reims*, ed. Michel Rouche (Paris, 1997), pp. 331–48.
- Pratt, David, *The Political Thought of King Alfred the Great* (Cambridge, 2007).
- Prinz, Friederich, *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich: Kultur und Gesellschaft in Gallien, den Rheinlanden und Bayern am Beispiel der monastischen Entwicklung (4. bis 8. Jahrhundert)*, 2nd ed. (Darmstadt, 1988).
- Provero, Luigi, see: Cristina La Rocca.

- Pucci, Joseph, *The Full-Knowing Reader: Allusion and the Power of the Reader in the Western Literary Tradition* (Yale, 1998).
- Quentin, Henri, *Les martyrologes historiques du Moyen Âge: étude sur la formation du martyrologe romain*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1908).
- Raaijmakers, Janneke, *The Making of the Monastic Community of Fulda, c.744–c.900* (Cambridge, 2012).
- Raby, Frederic J.E., *A History of Christian-Latin Poetry from the Beginnings to the Close of the Middle Ages*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1953).
- Raby, Frederic J.E., *A History of Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages*, 2 vols., 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1957).
- Rathofer, Johannes, "Altsächsische Literature," in *Kurzer Grundriß der germanischen Philologie bis 1500, vol. II: Literaturgeschichte*, ed. Ludwig Erich Schmitt (Berlin, 1971), pp. 247–61.
- Reynolds, Susan, *Fiefs and Vassals: The Medieval Evidence Reinterpreted* (New York, 1994).
- Reichardt, Alexander, *Der Codex Boernerianus der Briefe des Apostles Paulus (Msc. Dresd. A 145b) in Lichtdruck nachgebildet* (Leipzig, 1909).
- Die Reichenauer Mönchsgemeinschaft und ihr Totengedenken im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Roland Rappmann and Alfons Zettler (Sigmaringen, 1998).
- Reimitz, Helmut, *History, Frankish Identity and the Framing of Western Ethnicity, 550–850* (Cambridge, 2015).
- Rettig, Heinrich Christian Michael, *Antiquissimus Quattuor Evangeliorum Canoniconum Codex Sangellensis Graeco-Latinus Interlinearis* (Zürich, 1836).
- Reynolds, Roger, "The Pseudo-Hieronimian *De septem ordinibus ecclesiae*: Notes on Its Origins, Abridgments and Use in Early Medieval Canonical Collections," *Revue Bénédictine* 80 (1970), pp. 238–52.
- Reynolds, Roger, "The Organization, Law and Liturgy of the Western Church, 700–900," in *NCMH*, pp. 587–621.
- Riché, Pierre, "Les bibliothèques de trois aristocrates laïcs carolingiens," *Le Moyen Âge* 69 (1963), pp. 87–104.
- Riché, Pierre, *Education and Culture in the Barbarian West, Sixth through Eighth Centuries*, trans. John Contreni (Columbia, SC: 1976).
- Riché, Pierre, "Translations de reliques à l'époque carolingienne. Histoire des reliques de Saint-Malo," *Le Moyen Âge* 82 (1976), pp. 201–18.
- Riché, Pierre, *Daily Life in the World of Charlemagne*, trans. Jo Ann McNamara (Philadelphia, 1978).
- Richter, Michael, "St. Gallen and the Irish in the early Middle Ages," in *Ogma: Essays in Celtic Studies in Honour of Próinséas Ní Chatháin*, ed. id. and Jean-Michel Picard (Dublin, 2002), pp. 65–75.
- Rio, Alice, "Freedom and Unfreedom in Early Medieval Francia: The Evidence of the Legal Formulae," *Past and Present* 193 (2006), pp. 7–40.
- Rio, Alice, *Legal Practice and the Written Word in the Early Middle Ages: Frankish Formularies, c. 500–1000* (Cambridge, 2009).
- Rissel, Maria, *Rezeption antiker und patristischer Wissenschaft bei Hrabanus Maurus. Studien zur karolingischen Geistesgeschichte* (Frankfurt am Main, 1976).
- Rist, John, "Augustine on Free Will and Predestination," *Journal of Theological Studies* 20 (1969), pp. 420–7.
- Rist, John, *Augustine: Ancient Thought Baptized* (Cambridge, 1994).
- Ritter, Adolf Martin, "(Auto-)Biographisches in den Dichtungen Gottschalks des Sachsen?" in *Scripturus vitam. Lateinische Biographie von der Antike bis in die Gegenwart. Festgabe für Walter Bershin zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Dorothea Walz (Heidelberg, 2002), pp. 407–21.

- Rituals of Power from Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Janet Nelson and Frans Theuvs (Leiden, 2000).
- Röckelein, Hedwig, *Reliquientranslationen nach Sachsen im 9. Jahrhundert: über Kommunikation, Mobilität und Öffentlichkeit im Frühmittelalter* (Stuttgart, 2002).
- Romig, Andrew, *Be a Perfect Man: Christian Masculinity and the Carolingian Aristocracy* (Philadelphia, forthcoming).
- Rosenwein, Barbara, "Introduction," in *Anger's Past: The Social Uses of an Emotion in the Middle Ages*, ed. ead. (Ithaca, 1998), pp. 1–8.
- Rosenwein, Barbara, "Writing Without Fear about Early Medieval Emotions," *EME* 10 (2001), pp. 229–34.
- Rosenwein, Barbara, "Y avait-il un 'moi' au haut Moyen Âge?" *Revue historique* 307 (2005), pp. 31–52.
- Rosenwein, Barbara, *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages* (Ithaca, 2006).
- Rubenstein, Jay, *Guibert of Nogent: Portrait of a Medieval Mind* (New York, 2002).
- Rupp, Heinz, "Forschung zur althochdeutschen Literatur 1945–1962," *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 38 (1964), pp. 1–67.
- Safran, Janina, "Identity and Differentiation in Ninth-Century al-Andalus," *Speculum* 76 (2001), pp. 573–98.
- Saint Antoine entre mythe et légende*, ed. Philippe Walter (Grenoble, 1996).
- Saller, Richard, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* (Cambridge, 1982).
- Sandmann, Mechthild, "Die Folge der Äbte," in *Die Klostersgemeinschaft von Fulda im früheren Mittelalter*, ed. Karl Schmid, vol. I (Munich, 1978), pp. 178–204.
- Sandmann, Mechthild, "Hrabanus als Mönch, Abt und Erzbischof," in *Hrabanus und seine Schule*, ed. Winfried Browe (Fulda, 1980), pp. 13–47.
- Sausser, Ekkart, "Egil (Eigil)," *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, vol. 21 (Nordhausen, 2003), p. 351.
- Schäferdiek, Knut, "Remigius von Reims, Kirchenmann einer Unbruchzeit," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 94 (1983), pp. 256–78.
- Schaller, Dieter, "Poetic Rivalries at the Court of Charlemagne," in *Classical Influences on European Culture, 500–1500*, ed. R.R. Bolgar (Cambridge, 1973), pp. 151–7.
- Scherrer, Gustav, *Verzeichnis des Handschriften der Stiftsbibliothek St. Gallen* (Halle, 1875).
- Schieffer, Rudolf, Gebhardt. *Handbuch der deutschen Geschichte. Band 2: Die Zeit des karolingischen Großreichs (714–887)*, 10th rev. ed. (Stuttgart, 2005).
- Schmid, Karl, and Joachim Wollasch, *Societas et Fraternitas: Begründung eines kommentierten Quellenwerkes zur Erforschung der Personen und Personengruppen des Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1975).
- Schnorr von Carolsfeld, Franz, *Katalog der Handschriften der königlichen Bibliothek zu Dresden* (Leipzig, 1882).
- Schönbach, Anton, "Über einige Evangelienkommentare des Mittelalters," *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften Wien* 146 (1903), pp. 1–175.
- Schramm, Percy, "Karl der Grosse: Denkart und Grundauffassungen—Die von ihm bewirkte 'correctio' (nicht 'Renaissance')," *Historische Zeitschrift* 198 (1964), pp. 306–45.
- Schramm, Percy, and Florentine Mutherich, *Denkmale der deutschen Könige und Kaiser* I, 2nd ed. (Munich, 1981).
- Schrimpf, Gangolf, "Hrabanus in die ethischen Implikationen der Auseinandersetzung zwischen Gottschalk und Hraban um die Prädestinationslehre," in *Hrabanus Maurus und seiner Schule*, ed. W. Böhne (Fulda, 1980), pp. 164–74.
- Schrimpf, Gangolf, "Der Beitrag des Johannes Scottus Eriugena zum Prädestinationsstreit," in *Die Iren und Europa im früheren Mittelalter*, ed. Heinrich Löwe (Stuttgart, 1982), pp. 819–65.

- Schrimpf, Gangolf, "Hraban und der Prädestinationsstreit des 9. Jahrhunderts," in *Hrabanus Maurus: Lehrer, Abt und Bischof*, ed. Raymund Kottje and Harald Zimmermann (Mainz, 1982), pp. 145–53.
- Schrimpf, Gangolf, *Das Werk des Johannes Scottus Eriugena im Rahmen des Wissenschaftsverständnisses seiner Zeit* (Münster, 1982).
- Schröbler, Ingeborg, "Glossen eines Germanisten zu Gottschalk von Orbais," *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 77 (1955), pp. 89–111.
- Schröbler, Ingeborg, "Fulda und die althochdeutsche Literatur," in *Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch* 1 (1960), pp. 1–26.
- Schroll, M. Alfred, *Benedictine Monasticism as Reflected in the Warnefrid-Hildemar Commentaries on the Rule* (New York, 1941).
- Schrörs, Heinrich, *Hincmar Erzbischof von Reims: Sein Leben und seine Schriften* (Freiburg, 1884; reprinted: Hildesheim, 1967).
- Schulenberg, Jane Tibbetts, "Female Sanctity: Public and Private Roles, ca. 500–1000," in *Women and Power in the Middle Ages*, ed. Mary Erler and Maryanne Kowaleski (Athens, GA: 1988) p. 116.
- Schulze, Hans, *Grundstrukturen der Verfassung im Mittelalter*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1985–6).
- Sears, Elizabeth, "Louis the Pious as *Miles Christi*: The Dedicatory Image in Hrabanus Maurus' *De laudibus sanctae crucis*," in *CH*, pp. 605–28.
- Semmler, Josef, "Karl der Grosse und das fränkische Mönchtum," in *Karl der Grosse. Lebenswerk und Nachleben, Bd. II: Das Geistige Leben*, ed. Bernhard Bischoff and Wolfgang Braunsfels (Düsseldorf, 1965), pp. 255–89.
- Semmler, Josef, "Benedictus II: una regula—una consuetudo," in *Benedictine Culture, 750–1050*, ed. Willem Lourdaux and David Verhelst (Leuven, 1983), pp. 1–49.
- Shanzer, Danuta, "Dating the Baptism of Clovis: the Bishop of Vienne vs the Bishop of Tours," *EME* 7 (1998), pp. 28–57.
- Sheldrake, Philip, *Spirituality and History: Questions of Interpretation and Method* (London, 1991).
- Shepard, Jonathan, "Slavs and Bulgars," in *NCMH*, pp. 228–48.
- The *Short Oxford History of Europe. The Early Middle Ages*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Oxford, 2001).
- Sigal, Pierre-André, "Les miracles de Sainte-Hélène à l'abbaye d'Hautvillers au Moyen-Âge et à l'époque moderne," *Actes du 97e Congrès national des Sociétés savantes, Nantes, 1972. Section de philologie et d'histoire jusqu'à 1610: Assistance et assistés jusqu'à 1610* (Paris, 1979), pp. 499–513.
- Simek, Rudolf, *Dictionary of Northern Mythology*, trans. Angela Hall (Cambridge, 1993).
- Smith, Jenny, "The Rebellious Monk Gottschalk of Orbais: Defining Heresy in a Medieval Debate on Predestination," *Eras* 17 (2015), pp. 1–24.
- Smith, Julia, *Europe after Rome: A New Cultural History, 500–1000* (Oxford, 2005).
- Smith, Julia, "'Emending Evil Ways and Praising God's Omnipotence': Einhard and the Uses of Roman Martyrs," in *Conversion in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages: Seeing and Believing*, ed. Kenneth Mills and Anthony Grafton (Rochester, NY: 2003), pp. 189–223.
- Smith, Julia, "Religion and Lay Society," in *The New Cambridge Medieval History, c 700–900*, ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 654–80.
- Smith, Thomas, *De Gratia: Faustus of Riez's Treatise on Grace and its Place in the History of Theology* (Notre Dame, 1990).
- Smith, Thomas, "Fulgentius of Ruspe," in *Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Allan Fitzgerald et al. (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 373–4.
- Sot, Michel, *Un historien et son église au Xe siècle: Flodoard de Reims* (Paris, 1993).
- Southern, Richard, *Saint Anselm: A Portrait in a Landscape* (Cambridge, 1990).

- Spencer, Mark, "Dating the Baptism of Clovis, 1886–1993," *EME* 3 (1994), pp. 97–116.
- Springer, Matthias, *Die Sachsen* (Stuttgart, 2004).
- Stanley, Eric, *The Search for Anglo-Saxon Paganism* (Cambridge, 1975), reprinted: *Imagining the Anglo-Saxon Past: The Search for Anglo-Saxon Paganism and Anglo-Saxon Trial by Jury* (Cambridge, 2000).
- Stegmüller, Otto, "Martin von Tours oder Gottschalk von Orbais?" *Revue Bénédictine* 76 (1966), pp. 177–230.
- Steinová, Evina, see van Renswoude, Irene.
- Stella, Francesco, "Gotescalco, la "scuola di Reims" e l'origine della rima mediolatina," in *Il verso europeo. Atti del seminario di metrica comparata* (Firenze, 4 maggio 1994), ed. id. (Florence, 1995), pp. 159–65.
- Stratmann, Martina, *Hinkmar von Reims als Verwalter von Bistum und Kirchenprovinz* (Sigmaringen, 1991).
- Stratmann, Martina, "De ministris Remensis ecclesiae. Eine Schrift Ebbos von Reims zur Diözesanverwaltung," in *Aus Archiven und Bibliotheken. Festschrift für Raymund Kottje zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Hubert Mordek (Frankfurt, 1992), pp. 121–35.
- Stratmann, Martina, "Zur Wirkungsgeschichte Hinkmars von Reims," *Francia* 22 (1995), pp. 1–43.
- Straw, Carol, *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection* (Berkeley, 1988).
- Studer, Basil, "Deus, Pater et Dominus bei Augustinus von Hippo," in *Essays in Tribute to G. C. Stead*, ed. Lionel Wickham and Caroline Bammel (Leiden, 1993), pp. 190–212.
- Szövérfy, Josef, *Die Annalen der lateinischen Hymnendichtung. Ein Handbuch* (Berlin, 1964).
- Szövérfy, Josef, *Weltliche Dichtungen des lateinischen Mittelalters: Ein Handbuch. I. Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende der Karolingerzeit* (Berlin, 1970).
- Szövérfy, Josef, *A Concise History of Medieval Latin Hymnody* (Leiden, 1985).
- Tabacco, Giovanni, *The Struggle for Power in Medieval Italy: Structures of political rule* (Cambridge, 1989).
- Tavard, George, *Trina deitas: the Controversy between Hincmar and Gottschalk* (Milwaukee, 1996).
- Tenckhoff, Franz, "Die Beziehungen des Bischofs Badurad von Paderborn zu Kaiser Ludwig und seinen Söhnen," *Westfälische Zeitschrift* 56 (1898), pp. 89–97.
- Tenckhoff, Franz, *Die Paderborner Bischöfe von Hathumar bis Rethar (806–1009)* (Paderborn, 1900), pp. 6–19.
- Texts and Transmissions: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, ed. Leighton Reynolds (Oxford, 1983).
- Tischler, Matthias, *Einharts Vita Karoli. Studien zur Entstehung, Überlieferung und Rezeption*, 2 vols. (Hanover, 2001).
- Trahern, Joseph, "Fatalism and the Millennium," in *The Cambridge Companion to Old English Literature*, ed. Malcolm Godden and Michael Lapidge (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 160–71.
- Traube, Ludwig, *O Roma nobilis* (Munich, 1892).
- Traube, Ludwig, *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen* (Munich, 1909).
- Trithemius, Johannes, *Chronicon monasterii Hirsaudiensis* (Frankfurt, 1601).
- Turner, Cuthbert Hamilton, "The *Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum*: Supplenda," *Journal of Theological Studies* 8 (1907), pp. 103–14.
- The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Yitzhak Hen and Matthew Innes (Cambridge, 2000).
- Ussher, James, *Gotteschalci, et praedestinatianae controversiae ab eo motae, historia: una cum duplici ejusdem confessione, nunc primum in lucem edita* (Dublin, 1631).

- Vandenbroucke, François, see: Jean Leclercq.
- van Egmond, Wolfert, "Converting Monks: Missionary Activity in Early Medieval Frisia and Saxony," in *Christianizing Peoples and Converting Individuals*, ed. Guyda Armstrong and Ian Wood (Turnhout, 2000), pp. 37–45.
- Van Name Edwards, Burton, see: Celia Chazelle.
- van Renswoude, Irene and Evina Steinová, "The Annotated Gottschalk: Symbolic Annotation and Control of Heterodoxy in the Carolingian Age," in *La controverse carolingienne sur la prédestination. Histoire, textes, manuscrits*, ed. Pierre Chambert-Protat, Jérémy Delmulle, Warren Pezé, and Jeremy Thompson (Paris, forthcoming, 2016).
- Vauchez, André, *The Spirituality of the Medieval West from the Eighth to the Twelfth Century*, trans. Colette Friedlander (Kalamazoo, 1993).
- Vielhaber, Klaus, *Gottschalk der Sachse* (Bonn, 1956).
- Vilmar, August Friederich Christian, *Deutsche Altertümer im Heliand als Einkleidung der evangelischen Geschichte* (Marburg, 1845).
- Vincent, Monique, *Saint Augustin, maître de prière: d'après Les Enarrationes in Psalmos* (Paris, 1990).
- Vlasto, Alexis, *The Entry of the Slavs into Christendom: An Introduction to the Medieval History of the Slavs* (Cambridge, 1970).
- Vogel, Cyrille, *Le Pêcheur et la pénitence au Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1969).
- Vogel, Cyrille, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, trans. and rev. William Storey and Niels Krogh Rasmussen (Washington, 1986).
- von Moos, Peter, "Gottschalks Gedicht *O mi custos*—eine *confessio*," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 4 (1970), pp. 201–30 and 5 (1971), pp. 317–58.
- von Padberg, Lutz, "Christen und Heiden. Zur Sicht des Heidentums in ausgewählter angelsachsen und fränkischer Überlieferung des 7. und 8. Jahrhunderts," in *Iconologia Sacra: Mythos, Bildkunst und Dichtung in der Religions- und Sozialgeschichte Alteuropas. Festschrift für Karl Hauck zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. Hagen Keller and Niklaus Staubach (Berlin, 1994), pp. 291–312.
- von Padberg, Lutz, "Zum Sachsenbild in hagiographischen Quellen," in *Studien zur Sachsenforschung* 12, ed. Hans-Jürgen Häßler, Jörg Jarnut and Matthias Wemhoff (Oldenburg, 1999), pp. 173–91.
- von Scarpatetti, Beat Matthias, *Katalog der datierten Handschriften*, 3 vols. (Zürich, 1977–91).
- von Schubter, Hans, *Geschichte des deutschen Glaubens im frühen Mittelalter* (Tübingen, 1921).
- Waddell, Helen, *The Wandering Scholars* (New York, 1927).
- Wallace-Hadrill, John Michael, "History in the Mind of Archbishop Hincmar," in *The Writing of History in the Middle Age: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern*, ed. Ralf Henry Carless Davis and id. (Oxford, 1981), pp. 43–70.
- Wallace-Hadrill, John Michael, *The Frankish Church* (Oxford, 1983).
- Ward, Elizabeth, "Caesar's Wife: The Career of the Empress Judith, 819–829," in *CH*, pp. 205–27.
- Wathen, Ambrose, *Silence: The Meaning of Silence in the Rule of St. Benedict* (Washington, DC: 1973).
- Weaver, Rebecca Harden, *Divine Grace and Human Agency: A Study of the Semi-Pelagian Controversy* (Macon, GA: 1996).
- Webb, Diana, *Medieval European Pilgrimage, c.700–c.1500* (New York, 2002).
- Weigel, Gustave, *Faustus of Riez: an Historical Introduction* (Philadelphia, 1938).

- Weinreich, Lorenz, *Wala: Graf, Mönch und Rebell. Die Biographie eines Karolingers* (Lübeck, 1963).
- Weitzel, Jürgen, "Die Normalität als Frage an das Schicksal des Gottschalk von Orbais," in *Religiöse Devianz. Untersuchungen zu sozialen, rechtlichen und theologischen Reaktionen auf religiöse Abweichung im westlichen und östlichen Mittelalter*, ed. Dieter Simon. (Frankfurt, 1990), pp. 211–29.
- Weitzel, Jürgen, "'Oblatio puerorum.' Der Konflikt zwischen väterlicher Gewalt und Selbstbestimmung im Lichte eines Instituts des mittelalterlichen Kirchenrechts," in *Vom mittelalterlichen Recht zur neuzeitlichen Rechtswissenschaft. Bedingungen, Wege und Probleme der europäischen Rechtsgeschichte. Winfried Trusen zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Norbert Brieskorn, Paul Mikat, Daniela Müller, and Dietmar Willoweit (Paderborn, 1994) pp. 59–74.
- Wemple, Suzanne Fonay, *Women in Frankish Society: Marriage and the Cloister, 500–900* (Philadelphia, 1981).
- Wenskus, Richard, *Sächsischer Stammesadel und fränkischer Reichsadel* (Göttingen, 1976).
- Wetzel, James, "Predestination, Pelagianism and Foreknowledge," in *The Cambridge Companion to Augustine*, ed. Eleonore Stump and Norman Kretzmann (Cambridge, 2001), pp. 49–58.
- White, Carolinne, *Christian Friendship in the Fourth Century* (Cambridge, 1992).
- Wicke, Hermann, "Der Dichter des Heliand als germanischer Verkündiger des Wortes Gottes," *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für niedersächsische Kirchengeschichte* 43 (1938), pp. 32–48.
- Wickham, Chris, *Early Medieval Italy: Central Power and Local Society, 400–1000*, (London, 1981).
- Wielfaert, Jared, *Prudentius of Troyes (d. 861) and the Reception of the Patristic Tradition in the Carolingian Era* (Dissertation, Toronto, 2015).
- Wilmart, André, "La lettre philosophique d'Almanne et son contexte littéraire," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen-Âge* 3 (1928), pp. 285–320.
- Wolff, Ludwig, "Germanisches Frühchristentum im Heliand," in *Zeitschrift für Deutsche Kunde* 49 (1935), pp. 37–54.
- Wolfram, Herwig, *Geschichte der Goten. Entwurf einer historischen Ethnologie* (Munich, 1979).
- Wolterstorff, Nicholas, "God's Speaking and Augustine's Conversion," in *Augustine's Confessions: Critical Essays*, ed. William Mann (Oxford, 2006), pp. 161–74.
- Wollasch, Joachim, see: Karl Schmid.
- Wood, Ian, "Pagan Religion and Superstition East of the Rhine from the Fifth to the Ninth Centuries," in *After Empire: Towards an Ethnology of Europe's Barbarians*, ed. G. Ausenda (Woodbridge, 1995), pp. 253–79.
- Wood, Ian, *The Merovingian Kingdoms 450–751* (New York, 1994).
- Wood, Ian, *The Missionary Life: Saints and the Evangelisation of Europe, 400–1050* (London, 2001).
- Wood, Ian, "An Absence of Saints? The Evidence for the Christianisation of Saxony," in *Am Vorabend der Kaiserkrönung*, ed. Peter Godman, Jorg Jarnut, and Peter Johanek (Paderborn, 2002), pp. 335–52.
- Wood, Ian, "Beyond Satraps and Ostriches: Political and Social Structures of the Saxons in the Early Carolingian Period," in *The Continental Saxons from the Migration Period to the Tenth Century*, ed. David Green and Frank Siegmund (Rochester, NY: 2003), pp. 271–99.

- Wright, Roger, *Late Latin and Early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France* (Liverpool, 1982).
- Yepes, Antonio, *Chroniques générales de l'ordre de Saint-Benoît*, trans. Martin Rethelois, vol. II (Toul, 1684).
- Zechiel-Eckes, Klaus, *Florus von Lyon als Kirchenpolitiker und Publizist* (Stuttgart, 1999).
- Zechiel-Eckes, Klaus, *Fälschung als Mittel politischer Auseinandersetzung. Ludwig der Fromme (814–840) und die Genese der pseudoisidorischen Dekretalen* (Paderborn, 2011).
- Zeddies, Nicole, "Bonifatius und zwei nützliche Rebellen: die Häretiker Aldebert und Clemens," in *Ordnung und Aufruhr im Mittelalter: historische und juristische Studien zur Rebellion*, ed. Marie Theres Fögen (Frankfurt, 1995), pp. 217–63.
- Zeddies, Nicole, *Religio et Sacrilegium: Studien zur Inkriminierung von Magie, Häresie und Heidentum (4.–7. Jahrhundert)* (Frankfurt am Main, 2003).

Index

- Abednago 170
 Abelard, Peter 10
Actus Petri cum Simone 189–90
 Adalbert, Frankish bishop and heretic 5
 Adalung, Bishop of Eichstadt 27
 Adalrham, Archbishop of Salzburg 27
 Adam 94, 166
 Adlaric, Saxon 36
Admonitio 53, 70–1, 73–4, 169, 176, 203
Admonitio generalis 115–16, 221
 Adoptionism 5, 110, 137, 140, 164, 186, 220, 223
 Aeneas, notary and Bishop of Paris 136, 151, 159, 205
 Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons 71, 221
 Albuin, Abbot of Mattigau (?) 27
 Alcuin 22, 26, 57, 85–6, 98, 112, 137, 139, 164, 192, 194, 195, 220, 222
 Almannus, hagiographer and monk of Haurvillers 60
 Amalarius, liturgist 5–6, 220, 221
 Amalung, Saxon 36
 Ames, Christine Caldwell 7
 Amolo, Archbishop of Lyons 120, 148, 153, 160–3, 165, 167, 207, 220
 Angelbert, poet 79
 Anselm 10
Annales Bertiniani 59, 77, 135, 141, 179, 204, 213
Annales Fuldenses 110–11, 113–14
Annales regni Francorum 35
Annales Xantenses 114
 Anskar, missionary 57, 80
 Antichrist 3, 118, 166, 178, 190–3, 210
 Aquileia 78
 Arbeo, Bishop of Bressanone 27
 Arianism 5, 187, 194, 222, 223
 Asig, Saxon 36
 Ascrih, priest from Fulda 104
 Assembly of Meersen (851) 148, 171–2, 174
 Audradus Modicus, poet and visionary 191
 Augustine 1, 6, 10, 11, 21–2, 67, 70, 76, 80–4, 88–9, 92–3, 96–9, 105–6, 108, 110, 117, 118, 120–8, 133, 136–7, 144, 145–6, 147, 151, 152–3, 155, 156, 157–61, 163, 168, 171, 182, 188, 191, 194, 196–7, 198, 200–1, 206, 210, 219–20, 222, 224, 228, 235
 Austin, J.L. 88
 Autun Sacramentary 140
 Babylon 170, 172–4
 Badurad, Bishop of Paderborn 27, 29, 33–4, 37–8
 Balkans 100
 Banniard, Michel 123
 Baturic, Bishop of Regensburg 27
 Bavo, Abbot of Orbais 59, 78, 151
 Becher, Matthias 35
 Bede 46, 49, 70, 132, 163, 224
 Benedict, Bishop of Speyer 27
 Benedict of Aniane 150, 164
 Benedict of Nursia 50
 Bennit, Saxon count 36
 Bern Bürgerbibliothek 83 11–12
 Bern Bürgerbibliothek 584 11–12, 13, 186, 198, 225, 227
 Bernard of Septimania 52, 58
 Beruo, Saxon count and Gottschalk's father 25, 33, 36
 Bernold, Bishop of Strasbourg 27, 30
 Bernwin, Archbishop of Besançon 27
 Bischoff, Bernhard 18, 54
 Bishops (*see also* individual bishops) 1, 3–5, 7, 8, 9, 20, 24, 26–7, 29–30, 31, 32–4, 37–41, 45, 46, 50–1, 54, 56–7, 60, 70, 72–3, 74, 76, 78, 79, 81, 84–5, 90, 94, 99–100, 107, 109–16, 119, 120, 127, 132, 133, 134–45, 148–9, 153, 156, 160–72, 178–80, 182–3, 185, 187, 197, 204–5, 207, 209–11, 212–14, 223, 233, 235, 236
 Blasphemy 170, 182, 189, 217, 222–4, 230
 Bongers, Jacques 12
 Boniface 5
 Boulhol, Pascal 121
 Bourges 168
Breviarium in Psalmos 68–73
 Bulgars 76, 100–2, 104, 236
 Byzantium 5, 101–2, 117
 Cædmon 45–6
 Calvin, Jean 11
Capitulare Saxonomum 36
 Cappuyns, Maïeul 120
 Cassiodorus 67, 201–2
 Cellot, Louis 153
 Charlemagne 25, 31–2, 35–6, 39, 43, 55, 57, 63, 84, 110, 115, 137, 140, 220, 221, 223
 Charles the Bald 1, 4, 9, 55, 58, 108, 119, 134, 136, 141, 148, 157–9, 168, 171–2, 179–81, 182, 215, 218, 234
 Chazelle, Celia 88, 184
 Chieti (Teate) 95
 Child Oblation 24–5, 28–34, 37–8, 40, 47–50, 232
 Civil war 8, 76, 78–9, 89, 152

- Claudius, Bishop of Turin 121
 Clementine (pseudo) 190
 Client (*cliens*) 19, 53, 55, 56–7, 61–6, 70–5, 97–8, 118, 207, 229
 Clovis 56, 218–19
 Coercion (including punishment) 1, 4, 6, 7–8, 22–3, 24, 30–2, 36, 41, 46–7, 50–1, 54, 61, 63, 76, 85, 89, 99, 111, 114–17, 119, 122, 126, 128–9, 132–3, 135–8, 141–5, 161–3, 166, 177, 179, 194, 195, 203, 204–5, 207–8, 214, 215, 216, 223, 231, 232–4
 Coercive reform as Carolingian strategy 7–8
 Compiègne 61, 217
 Confession 1–2, 4, 8, 12, 14, 18, 19, 74, 80–1, 85–6, 89, 91, 97, 98–9, 108–10, 118–29, 131–4, 145–6, 147, 153, 155–7, 159, 173–4, 186, 189, 198–9, 207–9, 223, 225, 226–7, 235–6
 Contamination (*see* pollution)
 Controversy (*see* scandal)
 Contumacy (*see* disobedience)
 Constantine I 112
 Constantine IV 187
 Coon, Lynda 4
 Corbie 12, 52, 57–9, 61, 65, 67–71, 73, 80, 134, 148, 151, 153–4, 157, 167, 169, 217, 236
Correctio (*see* reform)
 Corruption (*see* pollution)
 Corvey 43–4, 45
 Council of Constantinople (680–1), Sixth Ecumenical 187
 Council of Orange (529) 92
 Courcelle, Pierre 123
 Crispin and Crispinian, martyrs 17, 131–3
 Croatia 76, 101–3, 236
 Cyril, missionary 102

 Dalmatia 76, 100, 104, 143, 236
 Danes 55, 57, 74
 David, Bishop of Lausanne 27
 Davos, Leo 181
 Debate 4–5, 8–9, 11, 14, 16, 21, 22, 27, 40, 48, 77, 82, 84, 92, 94, 96, 99, 100, 106, 108, 110, 113, 116–17, 122, 144, 148, 150–1, 158, 159, 167–8, 172, 178–82, 186, 190, 193–4, 198–203, 208, 210–11, 214, 216, 234
 de Jong, Mayke 25, 29, 32, 194
 Devil (including demon) 3, 4, 43, 46, 48, 87, 88, 91, 93, 126, 132, 140, 148, 156, 161, 163, 165–7, 182, 206, 216, 223–4, 232
 Devisse, Jean 120, 144, 188
Diatesseron of Tatian 45
 Dinkler, Erich 18
 Diocletian 131
 Disciplined imagination 10
 Disease, spiritual (*see* pollution)
 Disobedience (including contumacy and obstinacy) 1, 4, 5, 7, 48, 49, 50, 51, 105, 115, 128, 130, 133, 137–8, 142, 156, 161–3, 165, 166, 170–1, 172, 183, 191, 194, 197, 200, 202, 203, 213, 233
 Dissent (*see also* resistance) 1, 2, 4, 6–8, 14, 22–3, 31, 75, 118, 147, 149, 165, 175, 176–7, 178, 209–10, 212, 217, 230, 232–7
 Dionysius Exiguus 143
 Divine inspiration 40, 46, 48, 50, 80, 93, 118–34, 145, 150, 157, 162, 217, 220–1, 225
 Donatus, grammarian 65, 159
 Dörries, Hermann 18
 Drogo, Bishop of Metz 27, 95, 107
 Dunchad 59
 Dungal 121
 Dutton, Paul Edward 4, 191

 Eberhard of Friuli 77–8, 83, 88–90, 100–8, 111, 113, 121, 169, 170, 234
 Ebbo, Archbishop of Rheims 28, 52–63, 65–8, 70–4, 77–8, 119, 151–3, 176, 179, 180, 183, 192, 210, 212–13, 215–16, 233, 234, 236, 237
 Ebbo, Bishop of Grenoble 180
 Ebbo clerics 176, 179, 183, 192, 210, 212–13, 215–16
 Ebbo Gospels 53, 56, 60–1
 Eburaccar, chorbishop 27
Ecclesiastica sententia in pertinacissimum Gotescalcum 137–8
 Egil, Abbot of Fulda 42
 Egil, Archbishop of Sens 148, 215–16
 Ehlen, Thomas 172
 Einhard 39, 43–4, 103
 Elect (and election) 1, 7–8, 14, 23, 75, 76, 80–1, 83–4, 88–9, 93, 96–7, 99, 103, 109, 118, 120, 121, 124–5, 128–30, 132–4, 135, 145–6, 147–8, 153, 155–7, 174, 175–6, 178, 184, 185, 186, 189–91, 198, 200, 202, 204, 207–8, 209–10, 212, 219–20, 226, 228–9, 230–1, 235–6
 Emmo, monk of Saint-Remi 12
 Epperlein, Siegfried 13, 197
Ergastulum 135, 138, 143, 148
 Ermold Nigellus 55, 57
 Error (*see also* heresy, novelties and sect) 4, 7–8, 42, 48, 50, 53, 79, 91, 93–4, 100, 105, 108, 111–13, 115, 118, 127, 128, 133, 140, 144, 145, 151, 159–63, 165–7, 169–71, 178, 207, 210, 220–1, 233–4, 236
 Eucharist 58, 104, 143, 150, 168, 214, 226, 227, 229
 Eucherius of Lyons 201–2
 Evagrius 149
 Eve 166
Examen (*see* ordeal)
 Exclusion (*see also* forced inclusion) 7, 233

- Excommunication 4, 100, 119, 137–9, 150, 161, 166, 167, 212–13, 226, 232
- Exile 31, 90, 107, 145, 148, 172–5, 215
- Faustus, the Manichee from Rheims (Hincmar) 228
- Felix of Nola 140
- Felix of Urgel 137, 164, 223
- Fickermann, Norbert 13
- Firey, Abigail 112, 131, 140
- Fleury 153
- Flodoard 55, 56, 57, 150
- Florus of Lyons 79, 110, 122, 124, 135–7, 142, 144, 160–1, 180, 192, 205, 220, 221
- Folcric, Bishop of Troyes 57
- Folcuic, Bishop of Worms 27
- Forced Inclusion as Carolingian strategy 7
- Four Chapters (Synod of Quierzy, 853) 179–80, 205
- Four Chapters of Prudentius of Troyes 205, 209
- Freculf of Lisieux 104
- Freise, Eckhard 28–9
- Freystedt, Albert 181
- Frideric, Bishop of Maastricht 27
- Frisians 37–8, 42
- Friuli 101
- Frogs (as heretics) 200–2
- Frothar, Bishop of Toul 27
- Fulda 13, 24–33, 42, 45–51, 59, 74, 86, 103–4, 107–8, 113–14, 233
- Fulgentius 81, 96, 97, 108, 128, 157, 169, 194
- Garipzanov, Ildar 58
- Gebboin, Bishop of Osnabrück 27, 30
- Gelasian Sacramentary 63
- Gellone Sacramentary 140
- Genke, Victor 77
- Gennadius of Marseilles 92–3, 108, 110
- Gerfrid, Bishop of Münster 27, 29
- Gisela, daughter of Louis the Pious and Judith, spouse of Eberhard of Friuli 78
- Giselmar, Archbishop of Rheims 55
- Giselmar, monk of Corbie and missionary 55, 68, 80, 148, 152, 167, 236
- Gorman, Michael 123–4
- Gottschalk of Orbais, periods of his life:
 - Career as priest and missionary 76–106
 - Childhood and monastic youth 24–51
 - During Ebbo of Rheims' patronage 52–9
 - Imprisonment at Hautvillers as a young man 59–75
 - In custody during his trials 107–47
 - In custody after his trials at Hautvillers 148–231
- Gottschalk of Orbais (see also *schedulae*), works:
 - Adversaria in librum responsorialem* 217–26
 - Christe mearum* 53, 64, 84
 - Christe rex regum* 84, 86–8, 117, 175, 229
 - Confessio brevior* 12, 81, 120, 153, 155–7, 162
 - Confessio prolixior* 1–2, 12, 81, 118–34, 136, 145–6, 155–7, 162, 167, 168, 170, 174, 182, 189, 198, 199
 - De diversis* 224, 227–30
 - De in praepositione explanatio* 159–60
 - De praedestinatione* 186, 198–203
 - De trina deitate* 186, 194–7
 - Domino clementissimo* 53, 61–73
 - Domino gloriosissimo* (*Epistula ad Lupum*) 96–9
 - Ebbo Remense decus* 53, 60–1
 - Horologium* 225
 - Libellus* 108–9, 121, 124, 127, 136, 144–5, 153, 155, 160–3
 - O deus miseri* 84, 159
 - O mi custos* 18, 99, 123, 174
 - O veneranda dei suboles* 84
 - Opusculum secundum* 224
 - Quo ne tu missus doleas* 203–9
 - Responsa de diversis* 103, 136, 149–51, 185
 - Spes mea Christe* 53, 64–5, 84
 - Ut quid iubes* 148, 159, 172–5
- Gottschalk (*filiolus*) 102–3, 143
- Grace 2, 4, 7, 8, 11, 20, 76–7, 78, 80–1, 83–4, 86, 88–9, 91–4, 96–9, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 116–17, 118, 121, 123, 124, 126–7, 128, 129, 131, 134, 138, 143, 146, 147–8, 155–7, 166, 174, 176, 178, 179, 180, 185, 186, 190, 200, 204–5, 207–8, 209, 212, 214, 216, 218–20, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228–9, 235, 236
- Grammar 12, 60, 101, 159–60, 197, 198, 212, 217–26
- Gregorian Sacramentary 63
- Gregory of Tours 131
- Gregory the Great 48, 50, 106, 120, 140, 157, 159, 163, 217, 220–1, 225
- Guibert of Nogent 10
- Guntbert, follower of Gottschalk 148, 174, 203, 212–13, 215–16, 229–30, 236
- Hadubald, Archbishop of Cologne 27
- Haimo of Auxerre 192–3
- Halitgar, Bishop of Cambrai 55
- Harald, Danish king 55
- Harud, Bishop of Verden 27, 29
- Hatto, monk and abbot of Fulda 26–30, 32, 34, 108, 114, 233
- Haubrichs, Wolfgang 45
- Haudoin, Abbot of Hautvillers 59, 148, 150–2
- Hautvillers 4, 9, 59–61, 65, 70, 72, 99, 103, 119, 134–5, 147–53, 164, 168, 172, 174–6, 185, 188, 209–10, 212–13, 215–17, 225–7, 229–31, 233–4, 236
- Héliand* 44–7
- Herding, Otto 18

- Heresy (*see also* error, novelties, sect and individual heresies) 1, 2, 4–7, 14, 19, 22–3, 27, 40, 47–51, 76, 77, 89, 90–1, 93–4, 105–7, 110, 112–14, 116, 118–19, 120, 121, 122, 126, 127–9, 131, 133–43, 145–6, 147–8, 150, 151, 160–5, 167, 169, 171, 174, 175–6, 178, 181–2, 184, 186, 187–8, 190–2, 197, 198, 200–2, 204, 205, 209–10, 212, 213–14, 216, 217–28, 230–1, 232–6
- Hetto, Archbishop of Trier 27
- Hiddi, Saxon 36
- Hilary of Poitiers 112, 140, 182, 223
- Hildegard, Bishop of Meaux 182
- Hildemar of Civite 94, 99, 150, 184
- Hildi, Bishop of Verdun 27
- Hilduin, archchaplain and Abbot of Saint–Denis 43, 115
- Himerius, Bishop of Tarragona 143
- Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims 4, 8–9, 12, 22, 59, 77, 78, 96, 101, 106, 108, 110, 114–15, 118–20, 122, 125, 131, 133–4, 135–45, 147–53, 157–62, 164–72, 174, 176–7, 178–94, 197–8, 202–7, 209–10, 212–21, 223–31, 232, 235–6
- Hitto, Bishop of Freising 27
- Holiness (including pseudo–holiness) 20, 48, 55, 91, 96, 110–11, 123, 133, 145, 147, 148, 159, 165–6, 171, 175, 182, 190, 193, 198, 202, 204, 210, 235
- Hrabanian heresy 120, 160–2
- Hrabanus Maurus, Abbot of Fulda and Archbishop of Mainz 8, 22, 24–31, 34, 39–45, 47–51, 53, 59, 76–8, 86, 88–93, 98, 100–1, 103–16, 118–22, 126–7, 132–4, 136, 137, 139, 144, 150, 152, 157, 158, 160–5, 167–71, 174, 182, 192, 195, 202, 206, 207, 215, 220, 224, 233, 236
- Hrudpert, priest from Fulda 104
- Hugh 26
- Humbert, chorbishop 27
- Humility (*see also* penance) 3, 19–20, 60, 63–4, 66, 72–3, 74, 75, 80, 81, 84, 88–9, 96–8, 104, 128, 133–4, 137–8, 155–6, 170–1, 173, 174, 175, 183, 190, 191, 197, 203–4, 207, 219, 224, 225, 226–9
- Hymns (*see also* specific hymns) 12, 18–19, 53, 64–5, 77, 84–9, 117, 123, 148, 160, 172–6, 181–2, 186–9, 225, 229, 232, 236
- Hypomnesticon* (Pseudo–Augustine) 92–3, 110, 128, 179, 200
- Iconoclasm 5, 121
- Indiculus superstitionum et paganiarum* 103
- Innocent I 139–40
- Insanity (*see* madness)
- Iogna–Pratt, Dominic 7
- Irish 59, 85, 94–5
- Isidore of Seville 48, 81, 95, 105, 126, 157, 163, 194
- Israel 40, 49, 66, 139, 162, 173–5
- Italy 1, 76–8, 90, 94–6, 99, 101–2, 104, 106–7, 115, 116, 121, 135, 215, 216, 234
- Jerome 48, 50, 68, 70, 72, 82, 91, 139, 169, 222–4
- Jesse, Bishop of Amiens 61
- Jews 7, 187, 223, 224
- John Eriugena 95, 120, 124, 133, 162–3, 168, 180, 204–5, 220
- Jolivet, Jean 181
- John the Deacon 217
- Jonas, notary and Bishop of Autun 153, 155, 158–60, 173
- Jonas, Bishop of Orléans 195
- Judith, empress 37, 52, 58, 78
- Kagerah, Walter 18, 181
- Kottje, Raymond 168
- Koziol, Geoffrey 4
- Lahngau 90
- Lambot, Cyrille 11–13, 54, 61, 95
- Lazarus 96–9, 123
- Le Maître, Philippe 121
- Leo IV, pope 206
- Libelli precum* 86–7
- Liturgy 5, 18, 63–4, 84–8, 130, 140, 188, 212, 217–26, 230
- Logic (*see also* syllogism) 81–2, 136, 151, 163, 165–6, 210, 234–5
- Lothar 54, 74, 78, 107, 171, 172, 179
- Lothar II 130, 180
- Louis the German 1, 52, 107, 108, 111–14, 136, 143, 171, 215
- Louis the Pious 5, 8, 26, 27, 31, 33, 36–8, 42–4, 46, 47, 52, 53–5, 58–9, 61, 63, 68, 74, 77, 78, 80, 84, 90, 192, 194, 204, 236
- Louis II 95, 99
- Loyal Rebellion (830) 52–3, 58, 71, 75, 233, 234
- Lupus, Abbot of Ferrières 57, 139, 153, 155, 158
- Lupus, Bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne 95
- Lupus, Bishop of Chieti 95–101, 116, 134, 153, 160, 234, 236
- Luther, Martin 11
- Madness (including insanity) 50, 79, 130, 133, 148, 149, 161–4, 169–70, 184, 213, 216
- Maguin, Gilbert 10–12
- Mainz 31, 55
- Manno, chorbishop 27
- Marcus, Irish scholar 95
- Marstheim 36
- Martha 98
- Martin, Thomas 122
- Martyr 2, 11, 14, 17, 23, 27, 75, 90, 118, 119, 128–33, 135, 145–6, 163, 171, 175, 178, 183, 190–3, 232, 235

- Martyrologia* 131–2
 Mary 55, 113
 Mary Magdalene 98
 Matcaudus 153, 155, 158
 Matfrid 26
 Matthias Flacius Illyricus 26
 Maximian, Roman emperor 132
 McCormick, Michael 100
 Methodius, missionary 102
 Microhistory 10
 Migne, Jacques Paul 12
 Milan 94
 Miracle 2, 17, 20, 35, 69, 128–30, 132–3, 189–90, 232, 235
 Mishak 170
 Mission 1, 14, 34, 42, 52, 55, 57, 75, 76–8, 80–1, 82–3, 88, 100, 101–2, 104, 116–17, 118, 147, 209, 232, 234, 236
 Mitterauer, Marie Christine 198
 Moengal (Marcellus), Irish scholar 95
 Monks 1–2, 4, 9, 12, 14, 15, 20, 24–7, 29, 30–3, 40, 41, 42, 44, 47–51, 52, 57–8, 59, 61, 64, 77–80, 85–6, 100, 111, 113–15, 117, 118, 119, 125, 129, 137–9, 141–3, 146, 147–51, 157, 161, 165, 169, 170, 174, 176, 178, 182, 184–5, 210, 212, 214, 215–16, 217, 225–7, 229–31, 232, 233, 236
 Moore, Robert 7
 Moravia 101–2
 Morin, Germain 12
 Moses 124–5, 139
 Mount Cénis 90

 Nationalist scholarship 11, 15, 45
Necrologium 9, 149, 212, 226, 227, 229, 231
 Nestorianism 5, 164, 220
 Nelson, Janet 218
 Nicene Creed 109
 Nicholas I, pope 135, 140, 183, 212–17, 230
 Nidgar, Bishop of Augburg 27
 Nijmegen 61
 Noting, Bishop of Verona 90–1, 94, 99, 106, 108, 111, 169
 Novelties (*see also* heresy and error) 4, 161, 163, 182, 188, 214, 217, 220–1, 225

 Obstinacy (*see* disobedience)
 Old Predestinarian heresy 184, 213–14
Opus Caroli regis 83, 220
 Orbais 1, 59, 77, 78, 118, 119, 124, 125, 132, 133, 134, 142, 151, 160, 161
 Ordeal (including *examen*) 2, 4, 17, 38, 120, 121, 128–34, 145, 163, 170–1, 178, 189, 191, 197
 Otrgar, Archbishop of Mainz 26–7, 30, 34, 107

 Pacificus, monk of Nonantola 94
 Paganism 7, 16, 41–3, 83, 103–4, 139, 171, 187, 201, 224, 232, 236

 Pannonia 26
 Paschasius Radbertus, theologian and Abbot of Corbie 59, 68–70, 98, 224
Passio sanctorum apostolorum Petri et Pauli 190
 Patripassian heresy 187
 Paul, Apostle 82, 90–1, 95, 96, 109, 113, 122, 124–5, 134, 139, 165, 192–3, 194–6, 209, 219–20
 Paulinus of Aquileia 99, 163
 Penance (including penitence and repentance) 3, 17, 19–20, 48, 54, 55, 63, 74, 80, 83, 84–7, 90, 91, 98, 99, 111, 115, 116, 123, 140, 143, 164, 167, 224–5
 Persecution 2, 6–9, 23, 51, 53, 56, 73, 118, 129, 132–3, 135, 145, 152, 174–6, 190, 192, 210, 233, 235
 Perversion (including depravity) 1, 4, 42, 93, 105, 128, 133, 138–40, 142, 143–4, 163–7, 182, 190, 199, 208, 210, 215, 227, 235
 Peter, Abbot of Hautvillers 60–1, 233
 Peter, Apostle 90, 113, 165, 189, 194–5
 Pezé, Warren 7
 Pilgrim 90, 115
 Pippin I 63, 143
 Pippin II of Aquitaine 143
 Pollution (including contamination, corruption and disease, spiritual) 3–5, 7, 31, 79, 86–7, 91, 93, 112–13, 139–40, 143, 145, 157, 163, 164, 165, 167, 184, 204, 210, 212, 216, 217, 219, 221–2, 224–5, 229, 233, 235–6
 Prayer 2, 9, 18–19, 25, 44, 61–3, 66, 72, 73, 80, 84–9, 96–9, 111, 112, 120, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128, 130, 132–4, 140, 149, 154, 167, 171, 172, 185, 186, 189, 191, 193, 195, 199, 204, 207, 212, 220, 221, 222, 225–30, 231
 Prophecy (including pseudoprophets) 82, 91, 101, 103, 110–11, 148, 165–6, 178, 182–4, 190–3, 197, 202, 232, 235
 Prosper of Aquitaine 92–3, 105–6, 139
 Prosper (pseudo) 188
 Prudentius, poet 188
 Prudentius of Troyes 13, 96, 163, 168, 178, 180, 188, 203–9, 213, 214, 216, 236
 Pseudo-Isidore 68
 Punishment (*see* coercion)

 Raaijmakers, Janneke 42
 Rädle, Felix 13, 204, 206
 Ratgar, Abbot of Fulda 26, 30–1, 47
 Ratramnus 57–9, 68, 80, 148, 151–8, 167–9, 180–2, 236
 Rebellion (*see also* dissent and resistance) 8, 35, 36, 37, 41, 43–4, 49, 53, 54, 58–9, 68, 71, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 148, 177, 194–7, 224, 234

- Reform (including *correctio*) 1, 2, 3–5, 6–7, 8, 9, 19, 22, 24, 26, 29, 32, 33, 41, 47–51, 52, 55, 56, 75, 76, 79, 81, 83, 84, 87, 91, 93, 99, 107, 110, 111–12, 113, 114, 115, 116, 127–8, 135, 136, 139, 140, 145, 147, 150, 160, 163, 164, 169–70, 171–2, 176–7, 178, 195, 201, 206–8, 210, 212–14, 217, 219, 221–5, 226, 231, 232–5, 237
- Reginheri, Bishop of Passau 27
- Reichenau 25, 54, 90, 94, 107–8
- Remigius, Archbishop of Rheims 56, 217–22, 225, 226, 230
- Remigius of Auxerre 67
- Remigius of Lyons 180
- Reprobate 1, 7, 76, 80–2, 91, 93, 108, 109, 118, 120, 127, 128, 134, 135, 141, 142, 145, 174, 176, 178, 189, 192, 199, 206, 209–10, 235
- Resistance (*see also* dissent and rebellion) 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 22–3, 24, 37, 39, 76, 82, 119, 120, 125, 137, 142, 145, 157, 161, 166, 170, 174, 176, 177, 178, 179, 182–203, 204, 205, 209–10, 212–16, 230–1, 232, 234–6
- Richart, Saxon 36
- Richolf, Saxon 36
- Rictiovarus 132
- Rimbert 80
- Rizinice 102
- Rheims 1, 12, 17, 52, 54, 55–6, 58, 59, 60, 77, 78, 86, 118, 119, 124, 134, 146, 153, 178, 180, 182, 190, 191, 192, 193, 203, 212, 217–18, 225, 228
- Roman antiphony 212, 217–26, 230
- Roman Empire 2, 42, 65, 95, 118, 235
- Rome 34, 90, 102, 104, 131, 212–14, 216
- Rothad, Bishop of Soissons 78, 140–1, 150, 212–15, 227
- Rudolf of Fulda 104
- Rule of Benedict (*Regula Benedicti*) 32–3, 85, 111–12, 115, 137, 141–2, 144, 150
- Rustics 184
- Sabellian heresy 187, 194, 227–8
- St. Anthony 149, 184
- St. Bernard Pass 90
- St. Denis 217
- St. Gallen 94–5
- Sanctorum meritis inclita gaudia* (hymn) 181–2, 188–9
- Saxons and Saxon ethnicity 11, 15, 17, 22, 24–5, 27–30, 33–47, 49, 50, 51, 58, 103–4, 232–3
- Scandal (including controversy) 8–9, 10, 70, 81–2, 99, 104–6, 107, 116, 119–20, 121, 122, 134, 139, 143, 147, 156, 178–203, 210, 212, 214, 215–16, 225–6, 230, 232, 234, 237
- Schedulae* 179, 185–90, 203
- Schrimpf, Gangolf 130, 168
- Schröbler, Ingeborg 103
- Schrörs, Heinrich 123, 130, 181, 198, 227
- Sciolus* 105, 184, 203
- Sect (*see also* error and heresy) 91, 94, 105–6, 114, 161–3, 166, 169–70, 173–4, 191
- Sedulius Scottus 95, 192
- Senlis 217
- Sergius II, pope 95
- Servus* (including *servitium*) 1–2, 19–20, 40–1, 44, 46–7, 53, 56–7, 60, 62, 63, 64–6, 71–3, 86–9, 127, 174–5, 188–9, 190, 192, 193, 195, 197, 198, 207, 221, 226, 229, 232
- Shadrak 170
- Sigimar, Abbot of Murbach 27
- Simon Magus 189–90
- Sin 1, 3–5, 7, 8, 19, 40, 46, 63, 72, 79–81, 83, 84–9, 91, 93, 94, 96, 98–9, 107, 112, 115, 120, 123, 125, 133, 139, 140, 147, 165, 166, 171, 173–4, 175, 188, 195, 198, 204–5, 221, 222, 223–5, 227, 228–9, 232–3, 235–6
- Sindolt, Abbot of Ellwangen 27
- Siricius, pope 143
- Sirmond, Jacques 12, 153
- Slavs 78, 100, 102
- Smaragdus 65
- Soissons 17, 131–3, 217
- Spain 5, 26, 204
- Splügen 90
- Stratmann, Martina 152
- Strecker, Karl 13
- Subversive strategies (*see also* debate, disobedience, scandal, *schedulae* and textual community) 7, 19, 109, 116, 118, 176, 209, 234
- Supplex libellus* 31
- Syllogism (*see also* logic) 82, 127, 151, 206
- Synod of Agde (506) 141–2
- Synod of Frankfurt (794) 83
- Synod of Friuli (796/797) 186
- Synod of Lyons (829) 54
- Synod of Mainz (813) 32, 111, 116, 138, 139
- Synod of Mainz (829) 24–9, 32, 40, 43, 47, 50–1, 52, 53, 54, 61, 233, 237
- Synod of Mainz (847) 110–12, 114, 138, 139, 140, 191
- Synod of Mainz (848) 1, 2, 4, 76, 77, 99, 106, 107–8, 110–16, 118–21, 128–9, 132, 133, 134–8, 141, 142, 145, 147, 160, 162
- Synod of Meaux-Paris (845 and 846) 138
- Synod of Paris (829) 54, 56, 84
- Synod of Pavia (850) 99–100
- Synod of Quierzy (838) 221
- Synod of Quierzy (849) 4, 59, 95, 99, 114, 118–19, 134–46, 147–9, 150, 151, 156, 159, 160, 161, 162, 172, 179, 180, 183, 198, 203, 207, 214
- Synod of Quierzy (853) 178–80, 183, 204, 205, 207
- Synod of Savonnières (859) 180

- Synod of Soissons (853) 152, 178–9, 181–3, 185, 187, 189, 193, 227
 Synod of Toulouse (829) 54
 Synod of Tusey (860) 180, 212
 Synod of Valence (855) 172, 179–80, 205
 Szövérfy, Josef 18, 225
- Tacitus 103–4
 Tatto, Reichenau priest 54
 Tavad, George 181, 187
 Teachers (including false teachers) 18–19, 25, 57, 59, 60, 67, 69, 77, 87, 91, 104, 111, 112, 115, 137, 138, 154–5, 167, 184, 213, 232
 Thegan 55, 74
 Theology as politics on a cosmic scale 2–4, 7, 20, 81, 84, 106, 116, 235
 Theotger, Abbot of Herrieden 27
 Theotgrin, Bishop of Halberstadt 27
 Theutberga 130–1
 Textual community (see also *schedulae*, Gottschalk, *De trina deitate* and Gottschalk, *De praedestinatione*) 9, 184–5, 211
 Thiota of Alemannia 110–11, 113, 191
 Tonsure 13, 24–5, 27–33, 38–9, 50, 52, 59, 61
 Tours 26, 86, 131, 153
Translatio sancti Viti 39, 43–4
 Traube, Ludwig 13, 59, 64, 95, 120, 153
 Trinity 3, 22, 58, 112, 186–8, 224, 226, 227
 Triune deity (*trina deitas*) 14, 178–82, 185–9, 191, 194, 209, 228
 Trpimir, king of the Croats 101–4, 234, 236
 Twin predestination (*praedestinatio gemina*) 81–2, 88, 101, 108–9, 120–2, 124, 126–30, 133–4, 151, 153, 155, 157, 161, 173, 185, 186, 189, 204–6, 209, 212–16
- Udalric, Bishop of Basel 27
 Ussher, James 10–12
 Utrecht Psalter 56
- Venantius Fortunatus 222
 Venetians 100–1, 236
 Verona 94
 Vielhaber, Klaus 18, 59, 181, 187, 198
 Vikings 8, 114
 Vincent of Lérins 220
 Vitalis, archdeacon of Verona 94
 von Moos, Peter 18, 123
- Wala, Abbot of Corbie 52, 57–9, 61, 74
 Walahfrid Strabo 25, 54, 78, 90, 107–8, 206, 236
 Waldgoz, Bishop of Liège 27
 Walto, wayward monk from Trier 143
 Wandering monk (*monachus gyrovagus*) 100, 115–16, 138–9, 171, 174
 Weber, Marie-Luise 13, 18, 225
 Weitzel, Jürgen 28–9
 Wenilo, Archbishop of Sens 203, 205, 215
 Werden 45
 Wetli 25
 Widukind 37
 Williric, Bishop of Bremen 27, 29
 Winibert, Abbot of Schuttern 27
 Wolfgar, Bishop of Würzburg 27, 29
 Wolfgin, chorbishop 27
 Wolfleoz, Bishop of Constance 27
 Wood, Ian 37
 Worms, Assembly (829) 27, 28, 43, 47, 54
- Zacharias, pope 143
 Zeddies, Nicole 7